David Taunting Goliath:
Divine Judgment and Messianic Expectation

By
Rev. Kevin William Hale

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Master of Theology
at the University of Glasgow
in partnership with Edinburgh Theological Seminary

February 2020

Thesis Abstract

This thesis examines the use of the taunting language used by David and Goliath against each other in 1 Samuel 17 and its usefulness in understanding both the David and Goliath narrative and 1 Samuel as a whole, particularly as it pertains to the themes of messiah and king. The research examines such language in order to test the Christo-centric reading of the narrative. In the content of a literarily fascinating verbal onslaught, one finds a set of threats involving non-burial and carrion-eating animals that is linguistically, syntactically, and thematically similar to numerous threats throughout the Hebrew canon. When examined, one finds these judgement scenes to have both a common purpose of judgement and a common eschatological force. Further, when one examines, the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative against Ancient Near Eastern literature, various linguistic and narrative parallels are found which appear to share a very similar rhetorical function to the taunting language of 1 Samuel 17:43-47. In light of the shared function of the Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern analogues to both the taunting language of 1 Samuel 17 and the David and Goliath narrative as a whole, one rightly reads the latter as a purposeful text designed with a particular function related to divine judgement, authority, and eschatological force - ideas that are brought together in the themes of messiah

and king thus supporting a Christo-centric reading. This function of the David and Goliath narrative provides a clue to the potential purpose of its broader context. Indeed, when one situates 1 Samuel 17 in the broader narrative one finds that it is not an anomaly in how it functions but ties in with the narrative of 1 Samuel as a whole.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

For two years, my wife, Annie, has been a faithful and patient partner in this project. Her prayers and encouragement have been needed, felt, and appreciated far more than has been expressed. Her willingness to hear key ideas and large sections of my thesis processed and read aloud while constantly being interrupted with inner debate and dialogue about what I was trying to communicate has been more helpful than she knows.

Likewise, my children have walked with me as we did school together and entertained my feeble attempts to engage them with my work even when such engagement included reading Ancient Near Eastern treaty curses aloud and laughing at the audaciousness of what we found.

Professor John Angus MacLeod has been a patient supervisor, letting me explore what became an ever-expanding series of questions and kindly suggesting that I refocus when I had wandered too far afield. His willingness and ability to guide without dictating were invaluable for me as a student.

The Session and people of Christ Church Conway have offered incredible support throughout this project. In particular, Dr. Rob Holden and

Dr. Jeff Whittingham have been wonderful conversation partners and teachers always interested in what I was working on and always encouraging me to push ahead. Rachel Whittingham, librarian extraordinaire, has been beyond gracious with her time and support as she welcomed me into the library at Central Baptist College. Gage Jordan and Michael Kidd have regularly filled the pulpit at Christ Church Conway, faithfully preaching Christ to our faithful congregation, allowing me regular time for research and writing.

Throughout the process, Rev. Reed Dunn has been a constant companion, sounding board, and intellectual sparring partner. His questions, challenges, encouragement, and time have undoubtedly strengthened this work.

Finally, this project would simply not have been possible without the constant and extensive support of my parents, Morris and Judy Hale. Despite the early odds, I have learned to love learning.

Thank you all.

1 - Chapter 1: Introduction

The well-known story of David heroically engaging Goliath of Gath has garnered incredible scholarly attention and effort over the centuries. Like much of 1 and 2 Samuel, there are numerous text-critical issues in this section. In addition to the significant discrepancy found in the David and Goliath story, there appear to be issues of chronology, there are difficult questions of dating the composition which are related to genetic questions, there are various questions and theories regarding the historicity of the account, questions of both the scope of the David and Goliath narrative and how that narrative fits with the rest of Samuel, and there is an ongoing discussion of genre. These issues, among others, have led to a mountain of research in the areas of text criticism, form criticism, and source criticism. However, given the amount of work done on the book of Samuel and the David and Goliath narrative, remarkably less has been said about the meaning of the narrative, particularly the function of the taunting language in 1 Samuel 17:43-47 and how this language helps one understand the function of the David and Goliath narrative in its broader context.

The question of meaning raises a slew of other questions that often circle back around to the propaedeutic questions mentioned above while simul-

taneously introducing more general hermeneutic questions. In scholarly arenas, a great deal of time rightly is spent addressing such questions, while in pastoral and sermonic arenas questions of meaning are pushed to the fore due to the incessant, pragmatic reason of needing to say something about a particular passage on Sunday. As such, there is at times something of a gap that exists between three related poles: 1) the propaedeutic questions such as textual criticism, literary criticism, genre, historical setting, grammar and the like; 2) the hermeneutical questions of what one does with or without the data derived from propaedeutic questions concerning arriving at the meaning of the text; 3) the act of interpreting the passage.

The various treatments of the David and Goliath narrative provide a prime example of this gap. It is not difficult to find any number of studies ranging from lengthy discussions regarding the history of the text itself[1] to literary analysis[2] to allegorical moralisms calling us to slay the

1. Dominique Barthélemy, and others, *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism Papers of a Joint Research Venture* (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires, 1986).

2. David Firth, "'That the World May Know.' Narrative Poetics in 1 Samuel 16-17," in *Text & Task: Scripture and Mission,* ed. Michael Parsons, (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2012)., see also Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 2nd ed. (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 183-192.

giants in our lives who after all are not that tough.[3] One can find assertions that the narrative is a piece of a larger political puzzle a redactor is putting together to defend David as the legitimate king of Israel,[4] various theological interpretations highlighting Israel's mission in light of Yahweh's election,[5] what it means for Israel to trust Yahweh,[6] or as story functioning on multiple levels to contrast David and Saul from both a political and spiritual perspective. Some see this well-known story working to contrast the Philistine gods and Yahweh and to present Yahweh to Israel and the nations as the one who delivers.[7] In addition to the interpretations offered above, some approach the story from a biblical-theological perspective. More specifically, they approach the story from a redemptive-historical approach or more specific still, a Christo-centric

---

3. Malcolm Gladwell, *David and Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and the Art of Battling Giants* (London: Allen Lane, 2014), 3-15.

4. P. Kyle McCarter Jr., "The Apology of David," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99, no. 4 (1980): 489-504.

5. David G. Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, Apollos Old Testament Commentary, vol. 8 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2009), 190-204.

6. Stephen B. Chapman, *1 Samuel as Christian Scripture: A Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2016), 152-158.

7. Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, ed. James Luther, Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990-01-01), 127-134.

approach. In this light, the meaning of the text is related to the revelation of Jesus as the Messiah through typology, offering the reader a picture of Jesus, the true King who will deliver his people from their enemies.[8]

Saying there are gaps between the three poles of propaedeutic, hermeneutical, and interpretive questions is not to imply any necessary deficiency in the work of any of the authors and scholars mentioned. If, as Fokkelman states in his substantial, four-volume work on Samuel that extends to some 2,400 pages, "The large volume that these analyses occupy is the minimum required to do justice to the unity and diversity of the matter,"[9] then, surely we are on track to say such gaps do not exist necessarily due to a deficiency of scholarship but quite possibly due to the natural limitations of any particular project.

---

8. Graeme Goldsworthy, *Christ-Centered Biblical Theology: Hermeneutical Foundations and Principles* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012), 30. see also Sydney Greidanus, *Preaching Christ From the Old Testament: A Contemporary Hermeneutical Method* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 238-239.

9. J.P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel: A Full Interpretation Based on Stylistic and Structural Analysis, Volume Ii: The Crossing Fates (I Sam. 13-31 & Ii Sam. 1)*, Studia Semitica Neerlandica, vol. 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 1.

Despite the abundance of available literature concerned with 1 Samuel and the David and Goliath narrative the inherent limitations of the various works available have left several questions regarding the taunting language found in 1 Samuel 17:43-47 unanswered. Therefore, the current research will focus on answering, "How does the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative help one understand the function of the David and Goliath narrative in its broader context?" The goal in answering this question is to test the Christo-centric reading of 1 Samuel 17 that claims David is a type of Christ. While it is possible, and not necessarily wrong, to read the Old Testament in light of the New, allowing the presentation of Jesus as the new David, as found in passages such as Luke 1:32-33, to inform one's interpretation of Old Testament narrative, it is an entirely different claim to say one can read a passage as a messianic text on its merit. The inability to read the David and Goliath narrative as a messianic text in its own right would not necessarily invalidate a Christian theological interpretation to that end, but if 1 Samuel 17 can be understood as a messianic text without appeal to the New Testament, the case for the Christo-centric reading of this well-known story would undoubtedly be strengthened. With this stated goal, we vault ourselves into an ongoing debate regarding Old Testament Messianism and the degree to which one can rightly speak of such. In seeking to answer the stated question, the current research will focus on Old Testament and

Ancient Near Eastern judgement scenes involving birds and beasts feasting on the fallen enemies of Yahweh, narrative parallels with the David and Goliath story, and how these scenes help the reader understand the David and Goliath narrative, its function within the larger narrative of Samuel, and the function of Samuel as a whole. Recognizing the research foci raise certain questions, (e.g. Why see the taunting language as central to the David and Goliath narrative? Why see such language through a lens of judgement?) a few preliminary remarks regarding narrative methodology and the taunting language found in the David and Goliath narrative are in order before offering a more comprehensive research plan.

1.1 - Narrative Methodology

Scholarship interested in Samuel is confronted immediately with deciding how exactly to approach the narrative in order to get at its intended meaning. Broadly speaking, there are two approaches. On the one hand, one can explore the plethora of text-critical issues and the proposed sources behind the final text on the assertion that "There is no thematic unity in the received text of 17:1-18:30 (or even in 17:1-18:5)."[10] On the

10. P. Kyle McCarter Jr., *I Samuel*, ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel

other hand, one can follow the likes of Fokkelman who states, "I start with the given masoretic text and examine in literary terms whether it can be interpreted as a whole consistently and of itself."[11] While in some ways, the present work is unaffected by the broader discussion due to the narrow focus of the passage, the implications of which are explored below, in other ways, the desire of the present work to answer questions regarding the relation of the parts to the whole thrusts one directly back into the discussion of how one should approach the narrative. Is the whole to which the explored part (1 Sam 17:43-47) to be considered only in terms of the shorter LXX, itself possibly dependent on the proposed shorter Hebrews source, or is the there a whole, properly speaking, that extends beyond the shorter text to include all of 17:1-18:5 (or even 17:1-18:30), or even further to include all of Samuel? As Fokkelman points out, "17:1-18:5 does not contain any scenes each with a relatively independent plot."[12] Instead, "cap. 17 has one distinct plot (the narrative threads of the shepherd and the war starting at different points go together from v.32 onwards, but before this they were already attuned to one another) which unites six *scene-parts*:

Freedman, The Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries, vol. 8 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 307.

11. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry*, 144.

12. Ibid., 145.

1-11/12-22/23-31/32-40/41-54/55-18:5."[13] To frame the current work in the terms of Fokkelman's "levels of signification" for prose,[14] given the apparent literary and rhetorical significance of the inner workings of the level five (clauses) and level six (sentences) elements that constitute 1 Samuel 17:43-47, a level seven (sequence/speech) element contributing to level eight (scene-part), 17:41-55, we are interested in exploring the possibility that analogues to the level five and six elements of 1 Samuel 17:43-47 have a common rhetorical function throughout both the Hebrew canon and the Ancient Near East that may shed light on their use in the David and Goliath narrative. If the biblical and cultural analogues to the lower-level components inform the rhetorical function of these elements in the David and Goliath narrative, then to understand how the lower-level components relate the higher-level components one must consider the rhetorical function of the lower-level components. While such a process is undoubtedly a quicker obit around the hermeneutical spiral than what Fokkelmann intends in his work, examining the narrative in its broader literary context at various levels of signification may indeed help one understand the narrative as a cohesive unit by exploring how the literary background informs the theological goal[15] of the text.

---

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid., 4.

15. Firth, “Narrative Poetics,”, 23.

The benefit of such an examination, as the current research aims to show, does not stand in contrast to Fokkelman's question of a consistent narrative but contributes to it. Similarly, understanding how the literary background of the text at various points contributes to its meaning also works alongside the arguments of scholars such as David Firth who sought to examine the "poetics of the narrative sequencing"[16] in order to argue for the integrity and unity of the text as it stands.

1.2 - Taunting Language as Key to Understanding the Narrative

The verses recording the actual conversation between David and Goliath define the boundaries of the relevant text. While verses 41-42 set the stage describing the most immediate context and may perhaps provide some helpful detail, the taunting language with which the present work is concerned is confined to 17:43-47. Concerning David's words in this exchange, David Firth notes, "The narrative itself climaxes with David's speech to Goliath before the battle, a speech which concludes the process by which David's own speech patterns seek to recast the understanding of events that have been promulgated by Goliath (and which

16. Ibid.

have formed the basis of Saul's actions so far)."[17] The most recent words to be recast by David in his pre-battle speech are Goliath's words from his pre-battle speech. Firth goes on to say,

> Although there are a number of elements present within 1 Samuel 17, it is the element of speech that is of crucial importance because it is through it that David is able to announce his understanding of the ways of Yahweh, and also show the significance of his defeat of Goliath. What matters is not so much the fact that he kills Goliath but rather the interpretation that is to be placed upon it, which is that this victory is a testimony to the whole world of the reality of Yahweh.[18]

Further, as will be shown, David's speech, recorded in 1 Samuel 17:45-47, not only offers the interpretation of the events but also forms a highly structured chiasm with Goliath's speech recorded in 1 Samuel 17:43-44. A close look at the text of the David and Goliath narrative reveals verses 43-47 as key to understanding how the well-known story functioned in Israel for four reasons.

---

17. Ibid., 20.

18. Ibid., 29.

1.2.1 - Consistency of Textual Witnesses

First, the MT and LXX are substantially the same at this point in the narrative. While the MT of 1 Samuel 17 is roughly eighty-percent longer than the LXX, in his helpful analysis of the two texts, Emanuel Tov notes only six differences between the two texts in his translation of 1 Samuel 17:43-47.[19] Tov classifies five differences in the MT and LXX as, "Points at which the LXX shows minor deviations from the MT, where the LXX probably reflects different readings."[20] These differences are minor in that they do not change the meaning of the passage. The sixth difference is one word that is found only in the MT (הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, "this *very* day"[21] in the MT compared with σήμερον, "today" in the LXX). In addition to these few differences between the MT and the LXX in 1 Samuel 17:43-47, Tov notes three additional minor pluses in the text of the LXX that did not come out in his translation, which he based on the MT.[22] For example, the MT reads in verse 43, "Am I a dog that you come to me with sticks?" The LXX reads, "Am I like a dog that you

19. Emanuel Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, Vetus Testamentum, vol. 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 338-339.

20. Ibid., 336.

21. Ibid., 338-339.

22. Ibid., 336.

come to me with a stick and stones?"[23] As with the previous differences, the minor pluses do not change the meaning of the passage. In a narrative that has as many substantial differences as the David and Goliath narrative does, the sections without variation or with few and minor variations become valuable in helping one understand the purpose of the larger text across its various readings where such a common purpose exists.

1.2.2 - Use of Theological Language

Second, in the verses at hand, the author introduces theological language commonly associated with divine deliverance and messianic expectation. Alexander Rofé seeks to bring together various findings from the numerous critical studies in order to get at the meaning of the text.[24] Rofé examines the divine language found in David's speech to Goliath (1 Sm 17:45-47) focusing on his invocation of יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת in 1 Samuel

23. Ibid., 361-362.

24. Alexander Rofé, "The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology," in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel,* ed. Jacob Neusner and others, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987). see also Alexander Rofé, "David Overcomes Goliath (1 Samuel 17)," *Henoch* 37, no. 1 (2015): 66-100.

17:45, David's declaration that the effect of the victory of יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת will be, "all the earth will know that there is a God to Israel" (1 Sm 17:46), and a divine deliverance of the Philistines "into our hands" (1 Sm 17:47), phrases we will explore in more detail below. After examining this language "in the context of Israel's early religious tradition,"[25] against "the theological perception of war,"[26] and "in the context of its political background"[27] Rofé concludes, "All of a sudden, the subject of the story is a future war against all the Philistines. This is a war that will establish a new monarchy that will never be destroyed or surrendered to another people."[28] Finally, after a favorable examination of messianic expectations of the text in relation to the extant literature of the same period, Rofé concludes,

> These messianic expectations, if we have understood them correctly as such, provide the context for the David and Goliath story. David the shepherd boy, who vanquishes the Philistine giant, who removes disgrace from Israel (1 Sam. 17:26), who proclaims in the midst of the armed camps "that Israel has a God... and that God does not save

25. Rofé, “The Battle,”, 137.

26. Ibid., 138.

27. Ibid., 139.

28. Ibid.

through the sword and the spear–the war is the Lord's, for He will give you into our hands" (vv. 46-47), is not even a prototype for the Davidic descendant to be revealed. It is the very David, and none other, who will appear. He will bring down the uncircumcised giant, the pagan world empire, in one fell swoop–and with its downfall he will usher in Israel's redemption. "Strangers shall no longer make slaves of them; instead they shall serve the Lord their God and David, their king whom I will raise up for them."[29]

1.2.3 - Chiastic Structure of Taunts

Third, while Rofé's analysis of David's taunt is indeed a helpful contribution to understanding the David and Goliath narrative, he leaves unexplored a vital aspect of the taunt passage, wherein Goliath curses David, and David hurls the Philistine's words back at him with intensified language. Likewise, in his thorough analysis of the narrative structure of 1 Samuel 17, Fokkelman offers numerous helpful insights concerning David's speech in 17:45-47[30] while leaving the rhetorical relationship of the two speeches mostly untouched. A comparison of the structure of the

29. Ibid., 144. (Cf. McCarter Jr., *Samuel*, 294-297.

30. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry*, 178-183.

two taunts not only demonstrates the intensification but also points to authorial intent in highlighting the intensification. By setting them in parallel with each other one sees clearly what Robert Alter calls "vividly verisimilar dialogue"[31] forming an ABC/A'B'C'D pattern.

Comment on inadequacy of weaponry (vv43 & 45)	הֲכֶלֶב אָנֹכִי כִּי־אַתָּה בָּא־אֵלַי בַּמַּקְלוֹת	אַתָּה בָּא אֵלַי בְּחֶרֶב וּבַחֲנִית וּבְכִידוֹן וְאָנֹכִי בָּא־אֵלֶיךָ בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי מַעַרְכוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר חֵרַפְתָּ
Cursing by one's God (vv43 & 46)	וַיְקַלֵּל הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי אֶת־דָּוִד בֵּאלֹהָיו	הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה יְסַגֶּרְךָ יְהוָה בְּיָדִי וְהִכִּיתִךָ וַהֲסִרֹתִי אֶת־רֹאשְׁךָ מֵעָלֶיךָ
Threat of non-burial (vv44 & 46)	לְכָה אֵלַי וְאֶתְּנָה אֶת־בְּשָׂרְךָ לְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְבֶהֱמַת הַשָּׂדֶה	וְנָתַתִּי פֶּגֶר מַחֲנֵה פְלִשְׁתִּים הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה לְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְחַיַּת הָאָרֶץ
Significance of the outcome (v46-47)		וְיֵדְעוּ כָּל־הָאָרֶץ כִּי יֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים לְיִשְׂרָאֵל׃ וְיֵדְעוּ כָּל־הַקָּהָל הַזֶּה כִּי־לֹא בְחֶרֶב וּבַחֲנִית יְהוֹשִׁיעַ יְהוָה כִּי לַיהוָה הַמִּלְחָמָה וְנָתַן אֶתְכֶם בְּיָדֵנוּ

31. Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 188.

In the first parallel set (A/A'), both David and Goliath comment on the inadequacy of the other's weaponry and assert their dominance. However, whereas Goliath offers a hyperbolic mocking of David as a shepherd which overlooks or ignores his sling, contrasting Goliath's apparent dominance as a man of war, David accurately summarizes Goliath's weaponry, contrasting Goliath's physical tools of war with the dominance of יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. David's honest assessment of the weaponry, together with the invocation of the name of his God, gives greater weight to David's taunt.

In the second set (B/B'), the author reports that Goliath cursed David by his gods, but, when he turns to David, the author adds the specific content of David's divine cursing. While there are specific forms that particular types of curses may take, defining a curse is more about the intention of a particular utterance in any number of forms. Douglas Stuart offers a helpful definition of "curse,"

> to curse is to predict, wish, pray for, or cause trouble or disaster on a person or thing. Correspondingly, the predominant noun usages may be summarized in the following manner: a curse is the expression of

such a prediction, wish, prayer, or causation; or the result thereof; or, rarely, the object (person or thing) thereof."[32]

A curse can function in a wide variety of ways: naming the victim (Nu 5:21), offering a warning (Dt 28), making a threat (Gn 8:21), giving an insult (Lv 20:9), or announcing judgement (Nu 5:22). Further, one may intend a curse to have immediate (1Sm 17:43) or future (Dt 11:28-29) results, lasting from the short-term to the eternal (Dt 30:19). How a curse is designed to function can be understood by using slightly broader versions of Mansen's categories for evaluating threats of post-mortem abuse, 1) elements; 2) agent; 3) victim(s); 4) reason; and 5) intended result."[33]

The fact that David is announcing an outcome he is not equipped to carry out highlights the boldness of the curse in 1 Samuel 17:43-47. However, David offers no empty threat. A close comparison of the two taunts also reveals an important shift in verb forms between Goliath's volitional forms and David's perfect form with waw conversive declaring what will happen. In what proves to be a prophetic statement, David, the shepherd

---

32. Douglas Stuart, “Curse,” in *The Anchor Bible Dicitonaary: Voume 1: A-C,* ed. David Noel Freedman, (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1218.

33. Frances Dora Mansen, “Desecrated Covenant, Deprived Burial: Threats of Non-Burial in the Hebrew Bible” (Boston University, 2015), 5.

with a staff and a sling, announces Goliath's execution by decapitation. As Motyer states,

> for the Hebrew, just as a word was not a mere sound on the lips but an agent sent forth, so the spoken curse was an active agent for hurt. Behind the word stands the soul that created it. Thus, a word which is backed by no spiritual capacity of accomplishment is a mere 'word of the lip' (2 Ki. 18:20 RVmg.), but when the soul is powerful the word is clothed in that power (Ec. 8:4; 1 Ch. 21:4).[34]

The third parallel set (C/C') is a threat of non-burial from each contender. Again, David's threat is more intense than Goliath's. Goliath threatens David with non-burial saying, "I will give your flesh to the birds of the heavens and the beasts of the field." Goliath speaks in the singular in his threat. While one could take בְּשָׂרְךָ, "your flesh", as a collective noun referencing all of Israel, this does not make sense of the deal Goliath attempted to make with his enemy in his coming out and confronting the Israelites. The Philistine was looking for a win that would secure a slave force. Goliath would feed David to the birds and take Israel as servants of the Philistines. David, on the other hand, returned the threat of non-burial saying, פֶּגֶר מַחֲנֵה פְלִשְׁתִּים וְנָתַתִּי. David is not

34. Stuart, “Curse,”, 256.

looking for servants for Israel; he is looking for the destruction of the Philistines.

Regarding the obvious difference in the animals who will feast on the fallen, Ralph Klein notes, "Perhaps there is escalation in the contrast between 'cattle of the field' (בהמת השדה) in the Philistine's threat and 'animals of the earth' (חית הארץ) in David's."[35] While David Tsumura questions Klein's conclusion that the differing lexemes of David and Goliath represent an "escalation in the contrast,"[36] Tsumura does conclude, "The length of David's speech in vv. 45-47 is noteworthy in comparison with Goliath's short speech in v. 44. The contrast is intentional."[37]

The final clause of the parallel set (D) is one-sided, highlighting the true meaning of what is happening with Israel. Yahweh is proving himself both to the whole world and to his own people, who are cowering before this worldly threat. Israel is not without a God, and the God of Israel is

35. Ralph W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, ed. David Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 10 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 180.

36. Ibid.

37. David Toshio Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, ed. R.K. Harrison and Robert L. Hubbard Jr., New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 464.

no local god but the true God of all creation. Rofé, whose conclusions are only strengthened by an acknowledgement of the parallel structure (or "vividly verisimilar dialogue"[38]) of the text, explores the point of this final, non-parallel clause is explored in his work. "No doubt the Jews were mocked for having no god, since no symbols of YHWH were manifest. David's declaration, then, constitutes a straightforward response to this mocking and slander; through David YHWH will reveal that he does exist."[39]

Further, within the broader parallel structure of the two speeches one finds a more formal example of Hebrew parallelism in v. 45 comparing how each combatant would come,[40] and "the double use of the divine name Yahweh [in v. 47] marks the climax of his speech and constitutes an inclusio with its double use toward the beginning of his speech (vv. 45-46)."[41] Such explicit use of literary devices in vv. 45-47 undergirds the hypothesis of a purposeful parallel structure existing between the presentation of Goliath's taunt and David's taunting response, which in

---

38. Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 188.

39. Rofé, “The Battle,”, 137.

40. John Woodhouse, *1 Samuel: Looking for a Leader*, ed. R. Kent Hughes, Preach the Word (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2008), 339n7..

41. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 464.

turn supports the view that the taunting scene is key to understanding the meaning of the David and Goliath narrative. While vv. 44-47 might not be considered a parallelism in the strict sense of Hebrew poetic parallelism, the composition of the narrative at this point seems designed to contrast the two speeches and highlight the point of the broader narrative through the use of lexical and thematic repetition, contrast, and intensification by setting the two speeches in parallel with each other.[42] Similar observations led Frances Dora Mansen to conclude, "Through manipulation and supplementation of Goliath's original taunt, David's taunt functions to cast him in the role of the clever, battle-ready, fearless, faithful leader, who will replace the inept and fearful Saul."[43] Additionally, David's parallel but exalted language in response to Goliath's public taunting would have been the expected response in Ancient Near Eastern settings when engaging in heroic flyting with one's opponent.[44]

---

42. See also Robert Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History.*, Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History, vol. 2 (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989). pp161-176 for a discussion of the literary structure of the entire David and Goliath narrative. Polzin notes, "This chapter's high degree of stylization--a kind of narrative ritualization--works together with its varied patterns of repetition to provide many signs of artful composition" (p164).

43. Mansen, “Desecrated Covenant”, 205.

44. Margaret R. Eaton, “Some Instances of Flyting in the Hebrew Bible,” *Journal for*

1.2.4 - Parallels to Threat of Non-burial

The fourth reason for seeing vv. 43-47 as key to understanding the broader narrative is the existence of numerous parallel passages wherein someone announces judgement with the threat of non-burial. Judgment scenes involving birds and beasts feasting on the fallen enemies are found at key points throughout the Old Testament (e.g. Dt 28:26, Ps 79:2-3, Is 18:6, Jer 7:33-8:2, 12:9, 15:3, 16:4, 19:7, 34:20, and Ez 32:4, 39:4 & 17). Additionally, passages presenting non-burial as judgement in less formulaic terms are found (e.g. Gn 40:19, Lv 26:22, Dt 21:23, 1 Kgs 14:11, 16:4, 21:23-24, 2 Kgs 9:10 & 36-37, Is 5:25, 14:18-19, 46:11, Jer 9:21, 25:33, 36:30, Ez 34:5-28, and Ps 83:11). Significantly, there are also several passages illustrating Yahweh's promises of redemption in terms of there being no reason to fear the beasts of the field (e.g. Lv 26:6, Is 35:9, Ez 34:25, and Hos 2:18). Both the literary structure of 1 Samuel 17:43-47 and the repeated use of similar language throughout the Old Testament to announce divine judgement highlight the import of the passage for understanding the function of the David and Goliath narrative.

---

the Study of the Old Supplement ... 61, (1994): 3-14.

1.3 - Messiah in the Old Testament

While we will address the messianic idea more thoroughly in the final chapter, with the stated goal of answering the proposed research questions in order to test the Christo-centric reading of the David and Goliath narrative that sees David as a type of Christ, it is necessary to offer something of starting place for the ongoing discussion of the relationship between the rhetorical function of the curse language employed in the taunts of 1 Samuel 17:43-47 and messianic expectation. Building on the use of "Yahweh's anointed" to address Cyrus in Isaiah 45:1, Motyer notes five features of Old Testament Messianism: Yahweh's choice of the messiah, redemption of Israel through the messiah, judgement of foes by the messiah, the messiah's dominion over the nations, and Yahweh's agency through the messiah.[45] To be sure the broader discussion of Old Testament Messianism provides various other avenues to organize the discussion such as the messianic offices of prophet, priest, and king, particular figures such as David or Moses, particular concepts such as kingship or eschatology, and even timing of the messiah - present or future (or eschatological in so far as one relates such realities to time). The proposed understanding has been chosen as a starting point because it

45. J. Alec Motyer, “Messiah,” in *New Bible Dictionary,* ed. J.D. Douglas and others, (Downers Grove: InterVaristy Press, 1982), 764.

speaks to the function and nature of the messiah in categories that are standard with many methods of organizing the discussion when considered in broader terms than merely the present royal figure. Therefore, to have a starting point in the present discussion, we will understand the messiah to be the chosen one of Yahweh through whom Yahweh will bring redemption and judgement and to whom Yahweh will give dominion. Choosing a starting point that comports with the broader concept of Old Testament Messianism creates a higher bar that must be met when considering the appropriateness of a Christological reading of the David and Goliath Narrative against its Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern backgrounds. In other words, to show that David and Goliath is "messianic" in the narrow sense that it is about David as, or becoming king, is no advancement. The present work is interested in whether one can read the David and Goliath story as a messianic story, or perhaps one should say a Messianic story, in a broader sense.

1.4 - Research Plan

While there is much work one could do on any of the four aspects previously mentioned, as state above, the current research will focus on Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern judgement scenes involving birds

and beasts feasting on the fallen enemies of Yahweh, narrative parallels with the David and Goliath story, and how these scenes help the reader understand the David and Goliath narrative, its function within the larger narrative of Samuel, the function of Samuel as a whole, and the validity of the Christo-centric reading.

1.4.1 - Chapter 2: The Old Testament Judgment Language of Birds and Beasts Feasting on Fallen Enemies of Yahweh

In chapter 2, we will examine the identified judgement scenes to answer such questions as, "To what degree can a paradigm for announcing judgement using the language of non-burial be established?" "To what extent can a common purpose be found in the judgement passages in view?" "What is the eschatological force of non-burial, judgement language?" "To what extent can the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative, 1 Samuel 17:43-47, be classified with judgement passages sharing similar language?" Defined scenes will be examined with reference to parallels of lexicography, syntax, and thematic purpose in order to establish, if possible, a paradigm of announcing eschatological judgement and Messianic expectation. We will answer these questions in chapter 2 on the way to addressing broader questions of the David and

Goliath narrative's function within 1 and 2 Samuel in their final, canonical form and what insight the narrative provides, for a possible understanding of King David as a Messianic King.

The abundance of literature on the various aspects of threats of non-burial highlights the rhetorical importance of non-burial curse language wherever it is found. However, while close examinations of such passages in the Torah and prophetic corpus as well as other Ancient Near Eastern texts have been offered, as yet, a close examination of the taunting language in the David and Goliath narrative against the Ancient Near Eastern background has not been offered. David Lamb's[46] work certainly gets close to such questions, yet, in the end, it is limited to a discussion of potential rhetorical impact of "trash talking" with virtually no interaction with the potential political or covenantal aspects of the exchange between David and Goliath in 1 Samuel 17:43-47.

1.4.2 - Chapter 3: The Rhetoric of the David and Goliath

46. David T. Lamb, "'I Will Strike You Down and Cut Off Your Head' (I Sam 17:46): Trash Talking, Derogatory Rhetoric, and Psychological Warfare in Ancient Israel," in *Warfare, Ritual, and Symbol in Biblical and Modern Contexts,* ed. Brad E. Kelle, Frank Richel Ames, and Jacob L. Wright, Ancient Israel and Its Literature, no. 18 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014).

Narrative in Its Canonical and Social Context

A few commentaries, articles, and dissertations hint at the importance of the Ancient Near Eastern background for understanding the 1 Samuel 17; however, none do much more than signal the apparent weight of the linguistic sparring between David and Goliath. For example, Mansen states, "Examples of thwarted attempts at non-burial appear in the Deuteronomistic History, and a number of them are situated during the complicated transfer of power from the Saulide to Davidic dynasties."[47] Further, in her examination of the David and Goliath narrative she notes,

> the literary presentation of non-burial in the taunts uttered by Goliath and David is fundamental to the author's ideas about what is important in this passage: 1) David's identity; 2) YHWH's role as Israel's protective warrior in favor of David's nascent kingship; 3) David and YHWH's relationship in the maintenance of the divine-Israelite covenant.[48]

While Mansen does point to the covenantal implications of the passage and notes that the language of vv43-47 is frequently neglected,[49] her fo-

47. Mansen, “Desecrated Covenant”, 168.

48. Ibid., 204.

49. Ibid., 197.

cus on the story as primarily a work of "character development"[50] leaves her affirming outright little more than Lamb. Similarly, Gevirtz's lengthy and helpful categorization of curses in biblical and Ancient Near Eastern documents only mentions the exchange between David and Goliath in passing. Pointing out the lack of more-in-depth examination of the David and Goliath narrative in these and similar works is hardly a critique but a recognition of the necessary limits of previous studies and the need to ask more specific questions regarding how the taunting language is being used in 1 Samuel 17:43-47 and the broader Samuel narrative. To be sure, the present study will likewise have its own set of limitations beyond which further work will need to be done.

While the existence of linguistic parallels between a biblical text and Ancient Near Eastern texts would signal that one should give some weight to such parallels, the existence of narrative parallels would increase the importance of the Ancient Near Eastern parallels in our understanding, and the overlap of the two would indeed demand one read the parallel texts in light of each other. Additionally, understanding how the narrative or parts thereof is understood in later Jewish writings may help grasp, if not the "original intent," then certainly the traditional meaning assigned to the narrative. However, the available space for the current

50. Ibid., 198.

study will limit the present work to the initial questions of Ancient Near Eastern linguistic and narrative parallels.

In order to properly understand the interpretive weight one should give to the covenantal structures and practices when examining 1 Samuel 17 the following questions will be answered in chapter 3: "What parallels, if any, can be found between the David and Goliath Narrative (and more broadly the History of David's Rise) and Ancient Near Eastern literature?" "To what degree are there linguistic and/or narrartive parallels between the taunting language of 1 Samuel 17:43-47 and Ancient Near Eastern analogues?" "How are these parallels functioning in their respective contexts?"

1.4.3 - Chapter 4: David as Messianic King in 1 Samuel

With an understanding of the taunting language of 1 Samuel 17 against its Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern background, chapter 4 will turn to an assessment of the how this language helps one understand the meaning and function of the David and Goliath narrative in its more immediate narrative context.

Scholars have offered various proposals for understanding the purpose of 1 Samuel ranging from understanding it as a simple record of Israel's history to an apologetic of David either as the rightful king or as a usurper to the throne to understanding it as a messianic text. Given conclusions reached in the first two chapters regarding the use of the taunting language found in 1 Samuel 17 throughout both Scripture and the Ancient Near East, there is good reason to explore the possibility of a narrative purpose that extends beyond either a simple, straightforward history or some type of revisionist apologetic for a particular king. While the function of 1 Samuel as some type of history is undoubtedly a valid line of questioning, and while an understanding of 1 Samuel as history, of whatever type, and an understanding of 1 Samuel as having a messianic function are not mutually exclusive, space does not allow the pursuit of every possible way forward. Therefore, the present research will focus on how conclusions drawn for the examination of the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative against its Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern background inform the reader on both the point of the David and Goliath narrative and 1 Samuel as a whole. Specifically, the research will examine the extent to which findings relating to the taunting language in the David and Goliath narrative accord with a messianic reading of the History of David's Rise and 1 Samuel more broadly. Does

1 Samuel 17 contribute anything to the discussion of David as Messianic King?

The discussion of David as Messianic King has branches running in every direction, as demonstrated by the proliferation of questions, scholarship, and conclusions briefly surveyed below. In the sea of scholarship, Rolf Knierim's article, "The Messianic Concept in the First Book of Samuel"[51] is distinct in its approach to the text, seeking to read the narrative in a manner largely consistent with the "canonical approach" or "canonical method". However, while there have been some attempts at a canonical or theological interpretation of First and Second Samuel as a whole, very few have taken up the task of seeking to understand specific stories using a canonical approach. One finds attempts at interpreting individual passages in light of the final form in the commentary by Brueggemann who states in his introduction,

> Excessive attention to flat historical questions violates the intent of the text. We may conclude that the story line of the Samuel narrative is in general “historically reliable”; that conclusion, however, is

51. Rolf P. Knierim, “The Messianic Concept in the First Book of Samuel,” in *Jesus and the Historian: Written in Honor of E.c. Colwell,* ed. F.T. Trotter, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968).

> beside the point for an understanding of what the narrative intends. The narrative proposes that much more is happening in Israel's life than can be discerned by flat historical questions.[52]

As we seek to understand how the David and Goliath narrative functions in its literary and historical context, recognizing that a redactor wove together various sources in order to tell a specific story is vital. Even if it were possible to identify a specific source consisting exclusively of the David and Goliath narrative, one would still be faced with the task of determining for what purpose the source in the manner he did.

There are numerous ways forward from this point by which one might better understand how a particular passage functions canonically. In addition to identifying and analyzing canonical parallels and the function of similar stories, scenes, and language in the broader Ancient Near Eastern setting, one could certainly benefit from examining how the story and its characters were understood and used in later writings. Even if, as is certainly the case, there was a development in a particular doctrine (e.g. Davidic Messianism), the degree to which a given text lay behind that doctrine in its developed form would be informative in understanding the function of the text in early contexts. To this end, one could

---

52. Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 4.

examine the presentation of David in the Old Testament and non-biblical Jewish literature in order to understand the nature and extent of the presentation of David as the expected Messianic King. Nevertheless, another option for grappling with such questions would be to examine how the language of king and messiah are used throughout the Old Testament canon. While there may be great benefit in any or all of these, due to space limitations, chapter 4 research will be focused on a lexical study and the development of the messianic idea throughout the Old Testament, seeking to answer only two questions: "To what degree is there agreement between the book of Samuel and the rest of the Old Testament regarding the nature and extent of expectation of a Messianic King?" and "To what degree is bringing divine judgement a fundamental aspect of the Messianic King?"

1.5 - Introduction to Findings and Arguments

The significance of the taunting language in the David and Goliath narrative has long been recognized; however, a close look at the use of the taunting language in 1 Samuel 17 and similar language throughout Scripture, a comparative, linguistic study with Ancient Near Eastern sources, and an analysis of the overlap between the function of taunting

language and the function of the messianic theme of 1 Samuel has not been undertaken. By examining these elements, this paper will work to provide a basis for a more thorough look at the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative, how this language functions in its immediate context, how it casts the David and Goliath narrative as a critical piece of the broader story being told throughout 1 Samuel, and with what confidence one might read 1 Samuel 17 in a Christo-centric manner.

In answering the proposed questions in chapter 2, the current research will argue that an examination of language typical of scenes of non-burial reveals a general paradigm for announcing judgement through threats of non-burial. Linguistic threats of this nature are used throughout Scripture to announce both the divine judgment and deliverance of Israel from her enemies, particularly when used in conjunction with the idea of Yahweh being known. Further, we will argue, through a comparative analysis of the non-burial language in the David and Goliath narrative and other, similar Deuteronomic curses, that an aspect of eschatological hope for the people of God is introduced. This point will be argued by connecting the judgement announced on her enemies with the curses

Yahweh said he would bring on the enemies of his people when he gathered them in again after scattering them.

Answers to the research questions in chapter 3, will allow us to argue that in light of the Ancient Near Eastern linguistic parallels for the biblical, non-burial language, often found in scenes involving deities, covenant administration and enforcement, and challenge to authority, one finds common eschatological implications, covenantal structures, and the invocation of the deity. Additionally, we will argue that the identification of Ancient Near Eastern narrative parallels wherein single/representative combat or taunting language are found point to a very purposeful story being told in 1 Samuel 17.

The answers to questions proposed in chapter 4 will build an argument through an interaction with the pertinent literature on the messiah in the Old Testament, a linguistic analysis of "king" and "anointing" language which will examine the subject, object, and purpose of anointing alongside the nominal uses of anointing, and a brief look at the broader messianic concept in the Old Testament. From such analysis, we will conclude that there was a purposeful literary drawing together of the themes of kingship and anointing in order to consistently present a kingly, messianic figure who is Yahweh's anointed. Further, we will show that the

divinely anointed king carried with him the authority and power to bring about divine judgement on the enemies of Israel thereby offering Israel a hopeful vision for her future via the expectation of the coming of the Messianic King. There is a heightening to the reality of future hope for Israel attached to the king of Israel when the narrative brings together the concepts of king and messiah pointing to substantial correspondence between the purposeful use of threats of non-burial and corpse abuse by carrion-eating animals and the work of the Messianic King.

2 - Chapter 2: The Old Testament Judgement Language of Birds and Beasts Feasting on Fallen Enemies of Yahweh

2.1 - Literature Review

One can hardly get started in a discussion of any part of 1 and 2 Samuel without addressing the numerous textual issues found in this grand narrative. Indeed, such discussions reach fever pitch with the David and Goliath narrative. In addition to textual concerns, the current research questions are related to several fields including rhetorical function, genre, Messianic expectations in OT literature and Jewish thought, the degree to which OT authors employed Ancient Near Eastern literary forms, and eschatological expectation in OT and Jewish thought.

2.1.1 - Wellhausen's Influence on Samuel Scholarship

The discussions surrounding the text of 1 Samuel 17 have, to a high degree, risen out of the larger conversation concerning the structure and

sources of 1 and 2 Samuel as a whole. One can hardly overstate Julius Wellhausen's influence on the scholarship surrounding 1 and 2 Samuel. Since the publication of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, wherein he stated the David and Goliath narrative "is involved in contradiction both with what goes before and with what follows it,"[53] the bulk of scholarly attention given to 1 and 2 Samuel has focused on source criticism.

2.1.2 - From a Source Critical Approach to a Canonical Approach to Samuel

A great deal of the research pertaining to the David and Goliath narrative has focused on the monumental text critical problems of the passage. The MT is eighty percent longer than the LXX. The conclusions to the text-critical discussion can be summarized along two general lines. De

53. Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1885), 263.

Vries,[54] Barthélemy,[55] Gooding,[56] Rofé,[57] van der Kooij,[58] Bergen,[59] Tsumura,[60] and Baldwin[61] see a Hebrew text as original and later shortened to form the LXX. However, one must note that the scholars mentioned reach their shared conclusion in different ways. Preference is given to the originality of the LXX by scholars such as Hertzberg,[62] Klein,[63]

---

54. SJ De Vries, "David's Victory Over the Philistine as Saga and as Legend," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, no. 1 (1973): 23-36.

55. Barthélemy and others, *Story of David and Goliath*.

56. Ibid.

57. Rofé, "The Battle,"

58. A. Van der Kooij, "The Story of David and Goliath: The Early History of Its Text," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 68, no. 1 (1992).

59. Robert D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*, The New American Commentary, vol. 7 (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1996).

60. Tsumura, *Samuel*.

61. Joyce G. Baldwin, *1 and 2 Samuel*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 8 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008).

62. Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *I & Ii Samuel: A Commentary*, ed. Peter Ackroyd and others, trans. J.S. Bowden, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964).

63. Klein, *Samuel*.

Lust,[64] Tov,[65] Auld and Ho,[66] and McCarter.[67] The same qualification of divergent paths leading to a common conclusion is in order here as well. The impasse on the issue of identifying the original text led Anthony Campbell to conclude, "a consensus is not in sight,"[68] and Auld and Ho state in regards to the seminal work on the matter published by Barthélemy, Gooding, Lust, and Tov, "the four distinguished scholars appear as far apart in their approaches to these issues at the end of their joint volume as at the beginning."[69]

The frustrated attempts to reach a conclusion on the shape of the original text has led other scholars such as Brueggemann to follow Child's canonical approach to the text attempting "to deal with each text in terms

64. Barthélemy and others, *Story of David and Goliath*.

65. Ibid. see also Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3 ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012).

66. A. Graeme Auld and Craig Y.S. Ho, “The Making of David and Goliath,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 56, (1992): 19-39.

67. McCarter Jr., *Samuel*.

68. Anthony F. Campbell, *1 Samuel*, ed. Rolf P. Knierim and Marvin A. Sweeney, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature, vol. VII (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003), 189.

69. Auld and Ho, “Making of David”, 19.

of the whole story."[70] Such an approach to the text in its final form as a whole leads Brueggemann to state concerning the David and Goliath narrative, "Though the narrative may have had a complex prehistory, it now is a powerful, well-crafted narrative capable of sustaining our interest and imagination through its long telling."[71] Child's and others' canonical-critical approach has opened the door for a new approach to the many textual issues in 1 and 2 Samuel, including those found in the David and Goliath narrative. While one may be hard-pressed to find a commentary that offers no awareness of the many textual issues from which 1 and 2 Samuel suffer, it seems even critical commentators willing to be so bold as to offer two commentaries on the text as did McCarter[72] are few and far between. Most, with Klein, acknowledge the weight of the issues, yet interpret the text in its final form. He writes,

> Our solution to the textual problem: the Hebrew text has been expanded in 17:21-31, 50, 55-58 and 18:1-5 by a series of excerpts from one or more alternate accounts. Since these additions are not internally consistent nor do we know their extent or their non-

70. Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 6.

71. Ibid., 127.

72. McCarter Jr., *Samuel*.

canonical function, it is futile to interpret them separately from their present context.[73]

2.1.3 - Specific Contributions of Hillers and Mansen

Two essential works bearing directly on the current research relating to rhetorical function and genre are the dissertations by Delbert Hillers[74] and Frances Dora Mansen[75]. Hillers's research, following the work of Korošec and Mendenhall, pressed the issue of correspondence between Hittite treaties and OT covenant structure as it pertains to the curses announced for violation of a given treaty or covenant, concluding,

> The parallels between treaty-curses and passages in the Old Testament are not accidental, but are principally due to the fact that throughout her early history up to the exile, Israel shared with her neighbors a common legal form, the treaty, and that this form was adopted as a basic element in Israel's religion.[76]

---

73. Klein, *Samuel*, 174.

74. Delbert R. Hillers, "Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets" (Johns Hopkins University, 1964).

75. Mansen, "Desecrated Covenant".

76. Hillers, "Treaty-Curses", 88.

In making his argument, Hillers identifies twenty "Old Testament parallels to treaty curses"[77] including "devouring animals"[78], "to eat the flesh of sons and daughters"[79], and "no burial"[80]. Of the latter, he writes, "This curse is usually quite stereotyped, containing these ideas typically: (1) the body will be unburied; (2) it will be food for bird and beast; (3) it will be like refuse on the face of the earth."[81] Hillers notes the prevalence of the curse of no-burial in the Old Testament citing Dt 28:28; 1 Kgs 14:11, 16:4, 21:24; 2 Kgs 9:10 & 36; Is 5:25; Jer 7:33, 8:2, 9:21, 14:16, 16:4 & 6, 22:19, 25:33, 34:20, 36:30; Ez 39:17-20; and Pss 79:2-3, 83:11 as examples of such a curse in prophetic literature. In a final comment, Hillers also notes 1 Samuel 17:43-46 and Genesis 40:19 "employ terms of this curse."[82]

Mansen, seeking to answer a different question than Hillers, challenges Hillers's formulation of the stereotypical "no burial" curse in order to explore the role of non-burial and forms of post-mortem abuse in the OT more generally. She revises Hillers's typology, proposing, "a description

77. Ibid., 43.

78. Ibid., 54.

79. Ibid., 62.

80. Ibid., 68.

81. Ibid., 69.

82. Ibid.

of references to non-burial that considers the following characteristics: 1) elements of post-mortem abuse; 2) agent; 3) victim; 4) reason; and 5) intended result."[83] Using her revised typology Mansen works "to show that 1) non-burial was not a static, formulaic literary element in ancient Israel, and 2) biblical authorship intentionally included the non-burial motif to make claims about the identity of both victims and agent."[84]

"The identification of non-burial as post-mortem abuse, recognizable by the presence of stereotypical language in these five interpretive categories, broadens the net of non-burial references beyond the scope of treaty-curses."[85] Indeed, Mansen claims to identify some 40 references to non-burial across 13 books using her broadened schematic. However, when she turns to analyze six, non-burial passages, looking at the "immediate literary context, lexical features, and rhetorical functions,"[86] Mansen identifies as one of her criteria "genre and literary form of non-burial."[87] With this analytic criterion in place, which assumes genre matters, one wonders why Mansen critiques Hillers on the grounds that

83. Mansen, “Desecrated Covenant”, vi.

84. Ibid., 186.

85. Ibid., iv.

86. Ibid., 190.

87. Ibid.

"Hillers's typological description of non-burial as a curse, related to the Mesopotamian treaty-curse and *maqlû* traditions, limited his designation of several threats of non-burial throughout the tripartite canon."[88] She later states, "[Hillers's] brief discussion described neither the variety of non-burial threats in the biblical literature, nor the implications of their varied usage."[89] Indeed, Hillers did not explore the full variety of non-burial for he had already limited the scope of his study to a particular genre, a category of analysis which Mansen acknowledged is important in examining non-burial passages. Further, Hillers did not set out to analyze non-burial. His research was in the area of treaty-curse of which non-burial was but one component.

2.1.4 - The Rhetoric of Derogatory Language

In addition to Hillers's and Mansen's dissertations, David T. Lamb and Margaret R. Eaton have explored the rhetorical value of derogatory language in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern cultures and their writings giving specific emphasis to 1 Samuel 17:43-47. Lamb examines the use of trash-talking across a broad spectrum of biblical and Ancient Near

88. Ibid., 5.

89. Ibid., 32.

Eastern texts before focusing on its use in 1 Samuel 17. Lamb's contribution is the statement of what is anecdotally apparent yet remained largely unstated, that is, trash talk in Scripture often has a theological aspect. "Through the medium of his prophets (Balaam, Elijah, Micaiah, Elisha's apprentice, and Isaiah), the text portrays Yhwh as a trash talker. Yes, Israel's enemies talk trash, but so do the heroes of the narrative, and even Israel's God."[90]

Eaton's examination is more specific than Lamb, considering flyting, "a widely attested style of speaking and writing, based on antiphonal insults from opposing forces."[91] Similar to Lamb, Eaton traces out examples of flyting across various genres and cultures, establishing a paradigm of the tradition. She sees in the David and Goliath narrative, "all the hallmarks of the flyting genre: agonistic setting with a public venue, contenders from opposing armies, verbal exchanges, insults and oaths in formulaic language, and martial outcome."[92]

While both Eaton's and Lamb's works are helpful in understanding something of the rhetorical function of the taunting language in the

90. Lamb, “Trash Talking,”, 127.

91. Eaton, “Instances of Flyting”, 1.

92. Ibid., 9.

David and Goliath narrative as trash talk or flyting, they do not have the effect of undermining the work of Mansen or Hillers as they are asking different questions relating to the function of the specific speech act--verbal or written.

2.2 - Chapter 2 Questions

In the conversation surrounding how to understand 1 and 2 Samuel, various scholars have made enormous and helpful contributions. When trying to understand the particular function of the taunting language in the David and Goliath narrative and the contribution such an understanding would make to our interpretation of 1 Samuel as a whole, the works of scholars such as Hillers, Mansen, Eaton, and Lamb are undoubtedly valuable. However, there is still more work to be done in answering specific questions regarding the taunting language of 1 Samuel 17:43-47 and how its function informs our understanding of the text in its context. In order to build on the discussion, the current research will examine four questions:

1. To what degree can a paradigm for announcing judgement using the language of non-burial be established?

2. To what extent can a common purpose be found in the judgement passages in view?

3. What is the eschatological force of non-burial, judgement language?

4. To what extent can the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative, 1 Samuel 17:43-47, be classified with judgement passages sharing similar language?

2.3 - To what degree can a paradigm for announcing judgement using the language of non-burial be established?

Numerous passages touching on non-burial and victims being prey for animals can be found throughout the Old Testament; however, these passages do not all function in the same way. Hillers highlights nineteen passages that fit his non-burial, treaty-curse paradigm. In addition, he mentions 1 Samuel 17:43-47 and Genesis 40:19 which, while not necessarily functioning as treaty-curses, fit the paradigm. Mansen mentions finding over forty passages dealing with non-burial, although she does not give them. The current research will begin with the two taunts found 1 Samuel 17:43-47, analyzing language and structures common to both threats. Then, using the lexemes and syntactical features found in the

recorded taunts of David and Goliath, parallel passages will be identified. The parallel passages will then be analyzed using Mansen's helpful categories-- "1) elements of post-mortem abuse; 2) agent of abuse; 3) victim(s) of abuse; 4) reason for abuse; and 5) intended result of abuse"[93]-- looking for thematic and structural parallels helpful in establishing a potential paradigm. The conclusions will then be set in relation to the previous works of both Hillers and Mansen to understand how the narrower question being asked in the present research may be informed by the previously asked and broader questions.

2.3.1 - 1 Samuel 17:43-47

The context of the David and Goliath taunts is the familiar scene of proposed but unanswered single-combat in the valley of Elah. As the story goes, the Israelite and Philistine armies gathered for battle on opposing sides of the valley. Each day, for forty days, the domineering Goliath would come forward and challenge the Israelites to send their best warrior to fight. His proposal was, "If he is able to fight with me and he kills me, then we will be to you for servants. And if I am able to fight with him and I kill him, then you will be to us for servants, and you will

93. Mansen, “Desecrated Covenant”, 5.

serve us" (1 Sm 17:9). Rather than meeting the challenge, the Israelite response was fleeing in fear. Even Saul, the king who was head and shoulders above the rest, was unable to respond.

While David's brothers gathered for battle with the Israelite army, David was at home caring for the family's flocks and going back-and-forth between the scene of the battle and his home in order to keep his father, Jesse, well-informed of new developments and the well-being of his other sons. On one such trip to the front, David arrived as the Israelite and Philistine troops gathered for their daily confrontation. As was the custom, Goliath stepped forward and issued his standard challenge.

Upon hearing the Philistine's challenge, David was incensed that an uncircumcised Philistine would defy the armies of the living God with no response and was so emboldened as to step forward to meet the challenge himself. After a vain attempt by Saul to equip the minimally armed David with his armor and sword, David went to meet Goliath with only his shepherd's staff, his sling, and five smooth stones he found in the stream. Seeing the apparently inadequate representative of the Israelites coming forward, Goliath approached David with disdain. It is in this context and at this point in the story that the mutual taunts of David and Goliath are recorded.

2.3.1.A - Analysis of the Taunting Language in 1 Samuel 17:43-47

Goliath's taunting of David is recorded in 1 Samuel 17:43-44 as follows, "And the Philistine said to David, 'Am I a dog that you are coming to me with sticks?' And the Philistine cursed David by his gods. And the Philistine said to David, 'Come to me, and I will give your flesh to the birds of the heavens and to the beasts of the field.'" The taunt can be broken into three parts: 1) mocking; 2) cursing by his gods; 3) threat of defeat and non-burial by giving of flesh to carrion-eating animals.

2.3.1.A.i - Goliath's Mock

Recognizing what has already been made clear to the reader, Goliath mocks David. Here is one, woefully unprepared in every sense as far as Goliath is concerned, coming to battle the Philistine champion whose very stature, equipment, and experience nearly defies description. Goliath does not count David a worthy foe. Goliath's question, "Am I a dog that you come to me with sticks?" builds on the view of a dog as a "con-

temptible animal,"[94] that is "despised and generally wretched."[95] Goliath's mock is designed to state that David has underestimated the fight. In Goliath's eyes, David does not know what he has gotten himself into. As the story goes, of course, the opposite is the case.

2.3.1.A.ii - Goliath's Divine Curse

Following the mocking of David, Goliath announces a divine curse or at least a curse "by his gods." As Klein notes, "the attempt to curse turns the military encounter into a theological struggle."[96] In David's mind, the struggle was already theological as Goliath, an uncircumcised Philistine, had defied the armies of the living God (1 Sm 17:26). The theological aspect of the battle signals more is at stake than land or human servitude. The battle will declare one deity more powerful and establish that deity as the true sovereign of both peoples.

---

94. N. Kiuchi, "כֶּלֶב," in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis: Volume 2,* ed. Willem A. VanGemeren, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 640.

95. D. Winton Thomas, "Kelebh 'Dog': Its Origin and Some Usages of it in the Old Testament," *Vetus Testamentum* 10, no. Fasc. 4 (1960), 427.

96. Klein, *Samuel*, 180.

Furthermore, the theological nature of the conflict may give the reader warrant for seeing the terms of the established suzerain-vassal relationships being challenged. If it is the case that suzerain-vassal treaties and relationships are at stake, the parallels noted by Hillers between the non-burial treaty-curses of Old Testament prophets, which he relates to curses commonly found in Ancient Near Eastern suzerain-vassal treaties, and the taunts of the passage at hand will bear all the more on the right interpretation of not only the David and Goliath narrative but also 1 and 2 Samuel as a whole.[97] Eaton acknowledges the possibility of a covenant-making role of taunting language, "A heroic flyting sometimes develops a contract between the two contestants."[98] We will explore such connections below.

2.3.1.A.iii - Goliath's Threat of Non-Burial

In his threat of non-burial, Goliath threatens to give David's flesh בְּשָׂרְךָ֣ to the birds and beasts. בָּשָׂר has a wide range of meanings, from skin, to offspring, to food, to human nature. One common use is in reference to a dead body (Gn 40:19, Ez 32:5, Ps 79:2), which is the correct meaning in

97. Hillers, “Treaty-Curses”, 69.

98. Eaton, “Instances of Flyting”, 8.

the present passage. Goliath is threatening to give David's dead body to the birds and beasts. That this is the correct meaning is supported by Goliath's earlier threat, "If he is able to fight with me and he kills me, then we will be to you for servants. And if I am able to fight with him and I kill him, then you will be to us for servants, and you will serve us" (1 Sm 17:9). The fight Goliath has in mind is a fight to the death. It is not by the birds and beasts that David will die; rather, his dead body will be food for them. Goliath threatens to give David's dead body לְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְבֶהֱמַת הַשָּׂדֶה. Goliath refers to the birds in a conventional way. עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם appears thirty-times in the OT, several times in threats of non-burial such as Deuteronomy 28:26 and 1 Kings 14:11. בְּהֶמַת הַשָּׂדֶה, while communicating the idea, only appears twice in the OT - once in 1 Samuel 17:44 and once in Joel 1:20.

2.3.1.A.iv - Conclusions to Analysis of Goliath's Taunt

Each of Mansen's categories-- abuse, agent, victim, reason, and intended result-- can be established either by Goliath's curse directly, or the broader context. The threatened abuse is the feeding of David to birds and beasts. Goliath, or Goliath in the power of and on behalf of his gods,

is the agent. David is the victim of the abuse, but the whole Israelite army and likely Israel herself would suffer as well. Though Goliath does not repeat himself in his taunt, the broader context shows the servitude of Israel is the intended result of this affair. Mansen gives three reasons behind Goliath's taunt.

> First, his taunt conveys self aggrandizement; the young, handsome, shepherd boy cannot defeat the mightiest of the Philistine forces. Second, the taunt demeans David's physical stature and method of engagement; David has no chance of self-preservation. Not only will he lose the battle, but also he will be so badly beaten that Goliath will possess of his flesh and dispose of it in the most disrespectful fashion. Third, Goliath's taunt mocks David's comrades: their chosen warrior representative will perish; and the Israelites lack the power even to collect his corpse.[99]

2.3.1.A.v - David's Taunt Compared and Contrasted with Goliath's

David's taunt is recorded in 1 Samuel 17:45-47 as follows,

---

99. Mansen, “Desecrated Covenant”, 201.

> And David said to the Philistine, 'You are coming to me with a sword and with a spear and with a javelin, and I am coming to you in the name of the Lord of hosts the God of the armies of Israel whom you have defied. This day Yahweh will deliver you into my hand, and I will kill you, and I will cut off your head from upon you, and I will give the corpse of the host of the Philistines this day to the birds of the heavens and to the living things of the earth, and all the earth will know that there is a God for Israel. And all this assembly will know that Yahweh does not save with sword or with spear for to Yahweh is the battle and he will give you into our hands.'"

There are four parts to David's taunt: 1) mocking; 2) invoking the name of God; 3) threat of defeat and non-burial by giving of flesh to carrion-eating animals; and 4) announcement of the result. As has already been pointed out there is significant correspondence between Goliath's taunt and the first three parts of David's taunt. Such correspondence should not surprise since, "The most effective way to counter the intimidating effects of derogatory rhetoric is to reciprocate in kind."[100] David adds the explicit announcement of the vindication of his God and his people as the intended outcome.

100.Lamb, “Trash Talking,”, 112.

Just as Goliath had pointed to the inferiority of David's weapons, so David demeans the value of Goliath's sword, spear, and javelin. David will not come with traditional weapons of war or the mere power they offer. David comes in the name of the Lord of hosts, attributing the promised victory to Yahweh.

While there is a great deal of overlap between the two taunts, four differences of note. First, David names the entire host of the Philistines rather than the champion fighting for them. David is not interested in taking captives, but in the destruction of the Philistines. In his response to Goliath's taunt, David raises the stakes. Second, David uses פֶּגֶר, corpse, in a singular, collective form referring to the entirety of the Philistine army. While conveying the same general idea as Goliath's בָּשָׂר, David's use of פֶּגֶר, a word which "frequently denotes the body at the time of death or soon after,"[101] makes the point more forcefully. Third, David promises to give the dead bodies of the Philistines to the birds of the heavens, just as Goliath had, and וּלְחַיַּת הָאָרֶץ, the living things of the earth, a different construction for animals that appears ten times in the OT - three times referencing non-burial (1 Sm 17:46; Ez 29:5; and Ps 79:2). Fourth,

101.*New Internationa Dictionary of Old Testament Theolgoy & Exegesis*, ed. Willem A. VanGemeren, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 577.

David's addition of a fourth stanza in his taunt, in which he announces Yahweh being known to Israel and all the earth as the intended result, highlights that he sees the current battle as uniquely religious. We will address this more fully below, but two points warrant a brief remark at present: What does it mean for "all the earth to know there is a God to Israel"? and How should one understand the preposition לְ?

The knowledge of Yahweh is a central theme in the Hebrew canon. In Exodus 5:2 Pharaoh boldly states, "Who is Yahweh that I should obey his voice to send out Israel? I do not know Yahweh, and also I will not send out Israel." In Deuteronomy 4:35, it was Israel's knowledge of Yahweh as God that set them apart from all other nations. The decline of Israel is announced in Judges 2:10 in terms of a generation that did not know the Lord having arisen. The author of Samuel gives the same explanation for the worthlessness of Eli's sons in 1 Samuel 2:12. When one comes to the prophets, the knowledge of Yahweh both on the part of his people and the nations is central to both his statements of judgement and redemption. Even Egypt will finally know the Lord and worship him (Is 19:21).

David's speech continues. His victory will drop more knowledge. Not only will all the earth "know that there is a God to Israel", but also they

will know that he saves according to his prerogative, power, and means-not with sword and spear. From this brief survey, which one could multiply many times over, one sees why Firth concludes, that David's victory, the outcome of which is global knowledge of Yahweh, "will be a declaration to the whole world of the reality of Yahweh."[102] David's declaration is a missiological statement.[103] "David has grasped the special nature of Israel's role before the nations in a way that Saul never does - Israel exists as a witness to the nations of the reality of Yahweh."[104] Brueggeman similarly concludes, "The purpose of David's victory is not simply to save Israel or defeat the Philistines. The purpose is the glorification of Yahweh in the eyes of the world."[105]

The preposition לְ functions to support the point made about the world knowing Yahweh. However, it is not immediately clear what exactly is the content of this knowledge as it pertains to Yahweh and Israel. One could take the preposition in a locative sense, "a God in Israel", which is not quickly ruled out due to the reality of geographical deities. The preposition could be taken possessively, "a God of Israel," which again

---

102. Firth, “Narrative Poetics,”, 31.

103. Ibid.

104. Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 200.

105. Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 132.

is not quickly ruled out as this was a question other nations had due to Israel's lack of idols. These first two possibilities would be little more than an announcement that Israel was like the other nations in having a god. Such a weak theological statement hardly seems to fit the bill for a statement that has been repeatedly called the theological center of the passage.[106] A third option is to read the preposition as a lamed of interest, "a God for Israel." The lamed of interest is not a denial of the truth asserted by the other potential categories but a statement of a grander truth. Yes, Israel has a God. More importantly, for the scene at hand, that God is for her. This understanding of the preposition fits with the next three points of David's speech in v47, "the Lord saves... the battle is the Lord's... he will give you into our hand."

2.3.1.A.vi - Taunt Analysis Conclusions

From this analysis of the taunting language found in Goliath and David's exchange, three conclusions can be drawn.

1. The employment of mocking language, divine curse, and the threat of non-burial by Goliath signals that Goliath sees the battle as having

106.Ibid., McCarter Jr., *Samuel*, 294, 297., Firth, “Narrative Poetics,”, 30.

implications both for the supremacy of the respective deities and for the suzerain to whom the Israelites will render service.

2. The similarities between Goliath's and David's taunts indicate the language used in formulaic and purposeful.

3. The manner in which David's taunt differs from Goliath's- the promised destruction of the entire Philistine army and the addition of the fourth stanza to the threat- shows that David does not see the battle as merely a redefining of the suzerain-vassal social structure. David sees the battle as holy war through which Yahweh will deliver Israel and through which Yahweh will show himself to be, both in Israel and in all the earth, the God of Israel.

4. In light of point three, our analysis of the taunting language of David and Goliath opens the door for seeing David functioning as messiah in the David and Goliath narrative. While the taunting language does not reveal David explicitly as the chosen one of Yahweh to whom Yahweh will give dominion, he is the one through whom Yahweh will bring redemption and judgement, and, by implication, he is the one Yahweh has chosen for this purpose and through whom dominion over the Philistines will be achieved.

These conclusions, particularly the second conclusion indicating formulaic curse language, raise the question of whether such language is found in other passages. It is to this question we now turn.

2.3.2 - Identification of Parallel Passages

David's repetition of Goliath's taunt seems to indicate a formulaic curse. To assess this possibility, we will begin with a brief discussion of how one may define a "curse" and how a curse may function. Then we will move to a lexical analysis of the taunting language in the David and Goliath narrative. Following this analysis, we will search out other verses in which similar words and structures are found to analyze the use of the similar language in the identified passages for a possible paradigm of judgement. We will only examine those passages that fit the category of "curse" as defined above.

In the two threats exchanged between David and Goliath, three categories of animals are given: בְּהֶמַת הַשָּׂדֶה, עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם, and חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ. These six words are found in various combinations in close proximity forty-two times in the MT. Fourteen of these forty-two uses pertain to non-burial: Dt 28:26, 1 Sm 17:44, 17:46, 1 Kgs 14:11, 16:4, 21:24; Jer

7:33, 15:3, 16:4, 19:7, 34:20, Ez 29:5, 32:4; and Ps 79:2. When the words are considered individually along with בְּשָׂר and פֶּגֶר and synonyms are added, one finds nearly eight hundred verses; thirty-nine passages pertain to non-burial: the fourteen listed above along with Gen 40:19, Lv 26:29-30, Dt 21:23, 2 Sm 4:12, 2 Sm 21:12, 2 Kgs 9:10, 34, 36-37, 2 Kgs 23:16, Is 5:25, Is 14:19-20, Jer 8:1-3, 9:21, Ez 6:5, 33:27, 34:5, 8, 37, 39:4, 17, Na 3:3, and Zep 1:17. Hillers's paradigm includes "refuse on the face of the earth"[107], and Mansen explores the language of non-burial such as being "cast out"[108], both ideas that appear in various non-burial passages already identified. When the words of "refuse" and "to cast out" along with their synonyms are included in the search Jeremiah 14:16, 25:33, 36:30, and Ps 83:9-11 can be added to the list of non-burial references, bringing the total to forty-three. One would assume a great deal of overlap between these forty-three and Mansen's "over forty examples of the non-burial motif"[109] which are referenced but not listed.

107. Hillers, “Treaty-Curses”, 69.

108. Mansen, “Desecrated Covenant”, 162-163,.

109. Ibid., vi.

2.3.3 - Analysis of Parallel Passages

The question the present section of the research is aiming to answer is, to what degree can a paradigm for announcing judgement using the language of non-burial be established? With a cursory look at the identified, parallel, non-burial passages, one sees these passages do not all function in the same manner. Before analyzing the text according to Mansen's categories-- abuse, agent, victim, reason, and intended result-- one must ask the genre question.

2.3.3.A - Analysis of the Genre of Parallel Passages

Several of the identified passages are not threats of judgement. Deuteronomy 21:23 is instruction for Israel regarding the handling of the body of one put to death for their crime. The instruction is given not to threaten judgment but to teach Israel not to defile the land God is giving them. 2 Sm 4:12, 2 Sm 21:12, 2 Kgs 9:34 & 36-37, 2 Kgs 23:16, Is 5:25, Ez 34:5 & 8, Ps 79:2, and Ps 83:8-9 are all descriptions of non-burial. While these passages may describe the carrying out of a threatened judgement, they do not contribute to the discussion of a paradigm for announcing judgement using the language of non-burial. Nahum 3:3 is difficult. While it is right to see the description of a future state, the state-

ments focused on the "mass of corpses" is functioning to describe the magnitude of the judgment rather than as a threat of judgement.

Ezekiel 39:17 is a unique passage in that it relates directly to a prophetic threat of non-burial, sharing a common language with such threats, but it is not a threat itself. Rather than a threat, Yahweh is giving instructions for carrying out the threat he has already made. Here, preparations are made for the fulfilment of Ezekiel 39:4-5.

2.3.3.A.i - Conclusions to Genre Analysis

With the descriptive passages set aside, twenty-two passages remain in addition to 1 Sm 17:43-47: Gn 40:19, Lv 26:29-30, Dt 28:26, 1 Kgs 14:11, 16:4, 21;24; 2 Kgs 9:10; Is 14:19-20; Jer 7:33-8:3, 9:21 (22), 14:16, 15:3, 16:4, 19:7, 25:33, 34:20; Ez 6:5, 29:5, 32:4-5, 33:27, 39:4-5, and Zep 1:17. These passages can be divided into four distinct groups. First, Genesis 40:19 stands on its own as both the only interpretation of a person's dream and the only threat for which Yahweh is not responsible or some other deity invoked. Second, Leviticus 26:29-30 and Deuteronomy 28:26 are both found in a list of sanctions Israel will receive for violating the covenant with Yahweh. Third, 1 Kings 14:11, 16:4, 21;24, and 2 Kings 9:10 are unique in their mention of a dog. The

only other mention of a dog as part of the threat is Jeremiah 15:3. Additionally, the three passages in 1 Kings are virtually identical and are the only Yahwehistic threats targeting individuals. Fourth, the remaining passages are all found in the latter prophets. We will analyze each passage according to Mansen's categories in order to determine if a paradigm for announcing judgment using the language of non-burial can be established, and if 1 Samuel 17:43-44 fits that paradigm.

2.3.3.B - Genesis 40:19

Gn 40:19 בְּעוֹד שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים יִשָּׂא פַרְעֹה אֶת־רֹאשְׁךָ מֵעָלֶיךָ וְתָלָה
אוֹתְךָ עַל־עֵץ וְאָכַל הָעוֹף אֶת־בְּשָׂרְךָ מֵעָלֶיךָ׃

"In three days Pharaoh will lift your head from upon you, and he will hang you on a tree. And the birds will eat your flesh from upon you."

Abuse[110]	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Decapitation, Hanging on a tree, Birds eating flesh	Pharaoh	Chief Baker (Gn 40:16)	An unnamed offense against Pharaoh (Gn 40:1)	

For reasons already stated, this passage is somewhat anomalous among the verses under consideration. Nonetheless, the threat of judgment by non-burial is present. The result could be assumed to be vindication for Pharaoh against whom the chief baker had committed a crime. However, the text is clear that the cupbearer was part of the crime as well, yet he went unpunished beyond his stint in prison.

2.3.3.C - Leviticus 26:29-30 and Deuteronomy 28:26

Lv 26:29-30 וַאֲכַלְתֶּם בְּשַׂר בְּנֵיכֶם וּבְשַׂר בְּנֹתֵיכֶם תֹּאכֵלוּ׃ וְהִשְׁמַדְתִּי אֶת־בָּמֹתֵיכֶם וְהִכְרַתִּי אֶת־חַמָּנֵיכֶם וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־פִּגְרֵיכֶם עַל־פִּגְרֵי גִלּוּלֵיכֶם וְגָעָלָה נַפְשִׁי אֶתְכֶם׃

110. Mansen is concerned with post-mortem abuse. I will include in this category the manner of death if it is mentioned.

"And you will eat the flesh of your sons and the flesh of your daughters you will eat. I will destroy your high places, and I will cut down your altars. I will put your corpses on the corpses of your idols, and my soul will loathe you."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Corpses piled on idols	Yahweh	Israel	Not heeding previous discipline for disobedience to the covenant (Lv 26:27)	The land enjoying its sabbaths (Lv 26:34)

Dt 28:26 וְהָיְתָה נִבְלָתְךָ לְמַאֲכָל לְכָל־עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְבֶהֱמַת הָאָרֶץ וְאֵין מַחֲרִיד׃

"And your corpse will be for food for all the birds of the heavens and for the beasts of the field, and there will be none to drive in terror."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Corpse food for birds and beasts	Yahweh	Israel	Not obeying the voice of Yahweh (Dt 28:15)	Destruction, that you may fear Yahweh (Dt 28:45-46, 58-59)

Leviticus 26:29-30 and Deuteronomy 28:26 are both part of more extensive lists of curses for disobedience to the covenant Yahweh made with his people. While they both contain threats of non-burial as an act of judgement for disobedience, the details of each threat differ significantly. Leviticus 26:29-30 contains an instance of cannibalism possibly appearing as part of the curse of non-burial; however, comparing Leviticus 26:29-30 with Deuteronomy 28:53, 55 and Jeremiah 19:9 it is probably better to read the cannibalism as an act of grim, hunger-induced desperation rather than as a threat of non-burial. In Leviticus 26:29-30, Yahweh also vows to pile the corpses of his people on the corpses of their idols. Deuteronomy 28:26 is the first canonical presentation of the non-burial language involving divinely charged birds and beasts eating the flesh of the enemies of Yahweh.

2.3.3.D - 1 Kings 14:11, 16:4, 21:23-24, and 2 Kings 9:10

1Kgs 14:11 הַמֵּת לְיָרָבְעָם בָּעִיר יֹאכְלוּ הַכְּלָבִים וְהַמֵּת בַּשָּׂדֶה יֹאכְלוּ עוֹף הַשָּׁמָיִם כִּי יְהוָה דִּבֵּר׃

"The one to Jeroboam who dies in the city the dogs will eat and the one who dies in the field the birds of the heavens will eat for Yahweh has spoken."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Dogs and birds eating the dead	Yahweh via Ahijah	The house of Jeroboam	Jeroboam's exceeding evil, idolatry, rejection of Yahweh, and leading Israel to sin (1 Kgs 14:9)	The cutting off of the house of Jeroboam and the giving up of Israel (1 Kgs 14:10, 16)

1Kgs 16:4 הַמֵּת לְבַעְשָׁא בָּעִיר יֹאכְלוּ הַכְּלָבִים וְהַמֵּת לוֹ בַּשָּׂדֶה יֹאכְלוּ עוֹף הַשָּׁמָיִם׃

"The one to Baasha who dies in the city the dogs will eat and the one to him who dies in the field the birds of the heavens will eat."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Dogs and birds eating the dead	Yahweh via Jehu	The house of Baasha	Because Baasha walked in the ways of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 16:2)	The sweeping away of Bassha's house, making Baasha's house like the house of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 16:3)

1Kgs 21:23-24 וְגַם־לְאִיזֶבֶל דִּבֶּר יְהוָה לֵאמֹר הַכְּלָבִים יֹאכְלוּ אֶת־אִיזֶבֶל בְּחֵל יִזְרְעֶאל׃ הַמֵּת לְאַחְאָב בָּעִיר יֹאכְלוּ הַכְּלָבִים וְהַמֵּת בַּשָּׂדֶה יֹאכְלוּ עוֹף הַשָּׁמָיִם׃

"And also of Jezebel Yahweh spoke saying, 'The dogs will eat Jezebel in the walls of Jezreel. The one to Ahab who dies in the city the dogs will eat and the one who dies in the field the birds of the heavens will eat.'"

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Dogs and birds eating the dead	Yahweh via Elijah	Jezebel and the house of Ahab	Made Israel sin (1 Kgs 21:22)	Making Ahab's house like the house of Jer-oboam and Baasha (1 Kgs 21:22)

2Kgs 9:10 וְאֶת־אִיזֶבֶל יֹאכְלוּ הַכְּלָבִים בְּחֶלְקַת יִזְרְעֶאל וְאֵין קֹבֵר וַיִּפְתַּח הַדֶּלֶת וַיָּנֹס׃

"'And Jezebel the dogs will eat in the territory of Jezreel, and there will be none to bury,' and he opened the door and fled."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Dogs eating the the body of Jezebel and non-burial	Yahweh via Elisha	Jezebel	Avenging the blood of the prophets (2 Kgs 9:7)	

The close connection between these four passages is apparent even on a surface reading of the texts. There are numerous lexical and thematic connections between the verses. One finds only three differences in 1 Kings 14:11, 16:4, and 21:24: 1) the named victim; 2) the inclusion of לוֹ in 1 Kings 16:4 making the already apparent victim of the second half of the threat explicit; and 3) the inclusion of כִּי יְהוָה דִּבֵּר at the end of 14:11. 1 Kings 21:23 attaches an explicit threat against Jezebel, King Ahab's wife. Such a threat against the wives of Jeroboam and Baasha is absent in 1 Kings 14 and 16. 2 Kings 9:10 repeats 1 Kings 21:23 with near-identical lexemes but a different word order. However, while the context of 2 Kings 9:10 is the same as 1 Kings 21:23, including the threat to make Ahab's house like the houses of Jeroboam and Baasha (2 Kgs 9:9), the explicit threat of non-burial against Ahab and his house is not included in 2 Kings 9.

2.3.3.E - Isaiah 14:19-20

Is 14:19-20 וְאַתָּה הָשְׁלַכְתָּ מִקִּבְרְךָ כְּנֵצֶר נִתְעָב לִבוּשׁ הֲרֻגִים מְטֹעֲנֵי
חֶרֶב יוֹרְדֵי אֶל־אַבְנֵי־בוֹר כְּפֶגֶר מוּבָס׃ לֹא־תֵחַד אִתָּם בִּקְבוּרָה
כִּי־אַרְצְךָ שִׁחַתָּ עַמְּךָ הָרָגְתָּ לֹא־יִקָּרֵא לְעוֹלָם זֶרַע מְרֵעִים׃

> And you have been cast from your grave like an abhorred sprout, clothed with the slain, those pierced with a sword, those who descend to the stone pit, like a trampled body. You will not be united with them in burial, because your land you destroyed, your people you killed. The seed of evildoers will not be named for eternity.

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Cast from the grave, not united with others in burial	The Lord of Hosts via Isaiah	King of Babylon	The violence they have done	Their off-spring will be forgotten

Here is pictured the ultimate triumph of Yahweh over the enemies of his people. The goal of the threat is the erasure of their legacy. The broader context of the passage brings the promises of deliverance and restoration first recorded canonically in passages such as Deuteronomy 30:3b, "And [Yahweh your God] will gather you from all the peoples which Yahweh your God scattered you," connecting the threat of non-burial against Babylon with Yahweh's promises or deliverance for his people.

2.3.3.F - Jeremiah 7:33-8:3; 9:21 (22); 14:16; 15:3; 16:4; 19:7; 25:33; and 34:20

Jer 7:33-8:3 וְהָיְתָה נִבְלַת הָעָם הַזֶּה לְמַאֲכָל לְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְבֶהֱמַת
הָאָרֶץ וְאֵין מַחֲרִיד׃ וְהִשְׁבַּתִּי מֵעָרֵי יְהוּדָה וּמֵחֻצוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם קוֹל
שָׂשׂוֹן וְקוֹל שִׂמְחָה קוֹל חָתָן וְקוֹל כַּלָּה כִּי לְחָרְבָּה תִּהְיֶה הָאָרֶץ׃
בָּעֵת הַהִיא נְאֻם־יְהוָה וְיוֹצִיאוּ [יוֹצִיאוּ] אֶת־עַצְמוֹת מַלְכֵי־יְהוּדָה
וְאֶת־עַצְמוֹת־שָׂרָיו וְאֶת־עַצְמוֹת הַכֹּהֲנִים וְאֶת ו עַצְמוֹת הַנְּבִיאִים וְאֶת
עַצְמוֹת יוֹשְׁבֵי־יְרוּשָׁלַם מִקִּבְרֵיהֶם׃ וּשְׁטָחוּם לַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְלַיָּרֵחַ וּלְכֹל ו
צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם אֲשֶׁר אֲהֵבוּם וַאֲשֶׁר עֲבָדוּם וַאֲשֶׁר הָלְכוּ אַחֲרֵיהֶם וַאֲשֶׁר
דָּרְשׁוּם וַאֲשֶׁר הִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לָהֶם לֹא יֵאָסְפוּ וְלֹא יִקָּבֵרוּ לְדֹמֶן עַל־פְּנֵי
הָאֲדָמָה יִהְיוּ׃ וְנִבְחַר מָוֶת מֵחַיִּים לְכֹל הַשְּׁאֵרִית הַנִּשְׁאָרִים
מִן־הַמִּשְׁפָּחָה הָרָעָה הַזֹּאת בְּכָל־הַמְּקֹמוֹת הַנִּשְׁאָרִים אֲשֶׁר הִדַּחְתִּים
שָׁם נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת׃ ס

And the corpses of this people will be for food for the birds of the heavens and for the beasts of the earth, and there will be none scaring them away. And I will cause to cease from the cities of Judah and from the streets of Jerusalem the voice of joy and the voice of

gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, because to waste the land will be.

In that time, utters Yahweh, they will dig out the bones of the kings of Judah and the bones of his princes and the bones the priests and the bones of the prophets and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem from their tombs. And they will spread them to the sun and to the moon the host of heavens which they loved them and which they served them and which they went after them and which they sought them and which they bowed down to them, they will not be gathered, and they will not be buried, for dung, upon the face of the ground, they will be. And death will be preferred from life for all the remnant remaining from this evil family in all the places remaining which I will banish them there utters Yahweh of hosts.

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Food for birds and beasts; digging out bones and scattering them on the ground; not gathered or buried; as dung	Yahweh via the people themselves	Sons of Judah (Jer 7:30)	Did evil in the sight of Yahweh (Jer 7:30); setting detestable things in the sanctuary (Jer 7:31)	The display of Yahweh's rejection of them

Jer 9:21 דַּבֵּר כֹּה נְאֻם־יְהוָה וְנָפְלָה נִבְלַת הָאָדָם כְּדֹמֶן עַל־פְּנֵי
הַשָּׂדֶה וּכְעָמִיר מֵאַחֲרֵי הַקֹּצֵר וְאֵין מְאַסֵּף׃ ס

"Speak thus utters Yahweh, the corpses of the men will fall as dung upon the face of the field and as sheaves from after the reaper and there will be no gathering."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Fall as dung and reaped sheaves; not gathered	Yahweh (Jer 9:16)	Inhabitants of Judah (Jer 9:11)	Disobedience to voice and law of Yahweh; serving Baals; following their own hearts	Jerusalem left in ruins (Jer 9:11)

Jer 14:16 וְהָעָם אֲשֶׁר־הֵמָּה נִבְּאִים לָהֶם יִהְיוּ מֻשְׁלָכִים בְּחֻצוֹת
יְרוּשָׁלַם מִפְּנֵי הָרָעָב וְהַחֶרֶב וְאֵין מְקַבֵּר לָהֵמָּה הֵמָּה נְשֵׁיהֶם וּבְנֵיהֶם
וּבְנֹתֵיהֶם וְשָׁפַכְתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־רָעָתָם׃

"And the people who they prophesied to them they will be flung out in the streets of Jerusalem by the famine and the sword, and there will be

no burying of them the wives of them and the sons of them and the daughters of them, and I will pour out on them their evil."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Flung in streets; no burial	Yahweh	The prophets and people of Judah	The people love to go astray (Jer 14:10); the prophets are prophesying what Yahweh did not com-mand (Jer 14:14)	Not accepted by Yahweh (Jer 14:12)

Jer 15:3 וּפָקַדְתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם אַרְבַּע מִשְׁפָּחוֹת נְאֻם־יְהוָה אֶת־הַחֶרֶב לַהֲרֹג וְאֶת־הַכְּלָבִים לְסָחֵב וְאֶת־עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־בְּהֶמַת הָאָרֶץ לֶאֱכֹל וּלְהַשְׁחִית׃

"And I will appoint over them four kinds utters Yahweh, the sword to kill and the dogs to tear and the birds of the heavens and the beasts of the earth to eat and to destroy."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Dogs tearing; birds and beasts eating and destroying	Yahweh	The people of Judah	Manasseh's actions (Jer 15:4)	They will be destroyed and Yahweh will be vindicated (Jer 15)

Jer 16:4 מְמוֹתֵי תַחֲלָאִים יָמֻתוּ לֹא יִסָּפְדוּ וְלֹא יִקָּבֵרוּ לְדֹמֶן עַל־פְּנֵי
הָאֲדָמָה יִהְיוּ וּבַחֶרֶב וּבָרָעָב יִכְלוּ וְהָיְתָה נִבְלָתָם לְמַאֲכָל לְעוֹף
הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְבֶהֱמַת הָאָרֶץ׃ ס

"From deadly diseases they will die, there will be none to lament, and there will be none to bury, for dung on the face of the earth they will be, and by the sword and by famine they will perish, and their corpses will be for food to the birds of the heavens and to the beasts of the earth."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
None to bury; as dung on the earth; none to bury (see also v6)	Yahweh	The people of Judah	Their fathers had forsaken Yahweh and they had done worse (Jer 16:11-12)	They will be thrown out of the land and find no favor (Jer 16:13)

Jer 19:7 וּבַקֹּתִי אֶת־עֲצַת יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלַם בַּמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה וְהִפַּלְתִּים בַּחֶרֶב לִפְנֵי אֹיְבֵיהֶם וּבְיַד מְבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשָׁם וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־נִבְלָתָם לְמַאֲכָל לְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְבֶהֱמַת הָאָרֶץ׃

"And I will void the plans of Judah and Jerusalem in this place, and I will cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies and by the hand those seeking their life, and I will give their corpses for food to the birds of the heavens and to the beasts of the earth."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Corpses given as food for the birds and beasts	Yahweh	Judah and Jerusalem	The people had forsaken Yahweh; profaned the temple making offering to false gods; built high places to Baal	The city will be a scorn (Jer 19:8)

Jer 25:33 וְהָיוּ חַלְלֵי יְהוָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ וְעַד־קְצֵה הָאָרֶץ לֹא יִסָּפְדוּ וְלֹא יֵאָסְפוּ וְלֹא יִקָּבֵרוּ לְדֹמֶן עַל־פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה יִהְיוּ׃

"Those pierced of Yahweh shall be in that day from an end of the earth until the end of the earth, they shall not be lamented, and they shall not be gathered, and they shall not be buried, for dung on the face of the earth they will be."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Not lamented; not gathered; not buried; dung on the earth	Yahweh via the tribes of the north and Babylon	The people of Judah (Jer 25:1)	They had not obeyed the words of Yahweh (Jer 25:8)	Destruction, everlasting desolation; land will become a waste (Jer 25:10-11)

Jer 34:20 וְנָתַתִּי אוֹתָם בְּיַד אֹיְבֵיהֶם וּבְיַד מְבַקְּשֵׁי נַפְשָׁם וְהָיְתָה נִבְלָתָם לְמַאֲכָל לְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְבֶהֱמַת הָאָרֶץ׃

"And I will give them in the hand of their enemies and in the hand of those seeking their lives, and their corpses will be for food to the birds of the heavens and the beasts of the earth."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Corpses food for birds and beasts	Yahweh	The people of Judah	They violated the covenant Yahweh made with them	Their cities will be a desolation and have no inhabitants

These verses in Jeremiah illuminate why Mansen challenged Hillers's summary of non-burial curses in which he states, "This curse is usually quite stereotyped, containing typically these ideas: (1) the body will be unburied; (2) it will be food for bird and beast; (3) it will be like refuse on the face of the earth."[111] Rather than Hillers's three elements being typically found in each threat of non-burial, based on the Jeremiah verses, it is more accurate to say non-burial is typically expressed in one (or more) of three ways, "(1) the body will be unburied; (2) it will be food for bird and beast; (3) it will be like refuse on the face of the earth"[112] Only 7:33-8:3 contain all three of Hillers's ideas. Not one of the other Jeremiah verses contains all three ideas. Being as dung on the earth is always combined with some explicit statement of non-burial. Jeremiah 14:16 is the only example that does not include a metaphor for non-burial.

2.3.3.G - Ezekiel 6:5; 29:5; 32:4-5; 33:27; and 39:4-5

Ez 6:5 וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־פִּגְרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לִפְנֵי גִלּוּלֵיהֶם וְזֵרִיתִי
אֶת־עַצְמוֹתֵיכֶם סְבִיבוֹת מִזְבְּחוֹתֵיכֶם׃

111. Hillers, “Treaty-Curses”, 69.

112. Ibid.

"And I will put the corpses of the sons of Israel before their idols, and I will scatter your bones around your altars."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Putting corpses before idols; scattering bones around altars	Yahweh	Israel (6:2-3)	Idolatry	Knowledge of Yahweh (6:7)

Ez 29:5 וּנְטַשְׁתִּיךָ הַמִּדְבָּרָה אוֹתְךָ וְאֵת כָּל־דְּגַת יְאֹרֶיךָ עַל־פְּנֵי
הַשָּׂדֶה תִּפּוֹל לֹא תֵאָסֵף וְלֹא תִקָּבֵץ לְחַיַּת הָאָרֶץ וּלְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם
נְתַתִּיךָ לְאָכְלָה׃

"And I will forsake you to the wilderness, you and all the fish of your rivers, upon the face of the field you will fall, you will not be gathered and you will not be gathered, to the living things of the earth and to the birds of the heavens I will give you for food."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Corpses not gathered or buried; given to living things and birds as food	Yahweh	Egypt (29:2-3)	They have abused Israel (29:6-7)	Knowledge of Yahweh (29:6)

Ez 32:4-5 וּנְטַשְׁתִּיךָ בָאָרֶץ עַל־פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה אֲטִילֶךָּ וְהוֹשְׁכַנְתִּי עָלֶיךָ כָּל־עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהִשְׂבַּעְתִּי מִמְּךָ חַיַּת כָּל־הָאָרֶץ׃ וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־בְּשָׂרְךָ עַל־הֶהָרִים וּמִלֵּאתִי הַגֵּאָיוֹת רָמוּתֶךָ׃

"And I will forsake you in the earth, upon the face of the field I will fling you, and I will cause to settle upon you all the birds of the heavens, and I will cause to be filled from you the living things of all the earth. And I will put your flesh upon the mountains, and I will fill the valleys with your carcasses."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Being flung on the face of field, mountains, and valleys; birds and living things eating the corpses	Yahweh via Babylon	Pharaoh (32:2)	Its heart was proud (31:10)	Knowledge of Yahweh (32:15)

Ez 33:27 כֹּה־תֹאמַר אֲלֵהֶם כֹּה־אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה חַי־אָנִי אִם־לֹא אֲשֶׁר בֶּחֳרָבוֹת בַּחֶרֶב יִפֹּלוּ וַאֲשֶׁר עַל־פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה לַחַיָּה נְתַתִּיו לְאָכְלוֹ וַאֲשֶׁר בַּמְּצָדוֹת וּבַמְּעָרוֹת בַּדֶּבֶר יָמוּתוּ׃

"Thus you will say to them, 'Thus says the Lord God, 'As I live, those in the waste places, by the sword they will fall, and those upon the face of the field to the living thing I will give him for its food, and those in the strongholds and in the caves by the pestilence they will die."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Given to living thing for food	Yahweh	Israel (33:10)	Disobedi-ence and Idolatry (33:25-26)	Knowledge of Yahweh (33:29)

Ez 39:4-5 עַל־הָרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל תִּפּוֹל אַתָּה וְכָל־אֲגַפֶּיךָ וְעַמִּים אֲשֶׁר אִתָּךְ לְעֵיט צִפּוֹר כָּל־כָּנָף וְחַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה נְתַתִּיךָ לְאָכְלָה: עַל־פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה תִּפּוֹל כִּי אֲנִי דִבַּרְתִּי נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה:

"Upon the mountains of Israel you will fall and all your hordes and peo-ple who are with you to all kinds of bird of prey and living things of the field I will give you for food. Upon the face of the field you will fall for I have spoken utters the Lord God."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Food for birds of prey and living things; falling on the face of the field	Yahweh	Gog (39:1)	For coming against Israel (38:17-18)	Yahweh vindicating his holiness (38:16); Knowledge of Yahweh (38:23, 39:6-7)

Ezekiel is much more paradigmatic in his threats of non-burial than is Jeremiah. Four of the five threats found in Ezekiel reference carrion animals. Likewise, four of the threats include corpses being left in the open. Yahweh is always the agent, and the result is always, at least in part, an increased knowledge that he is Yahweh. The exceptions to the consistency of Ezekiel's threat are the victim and reason given. Israel, Egypt, and Gog are all listed as victims of Yahweh's threats of non-burial in Ezekiel. While a new victim does not necessitate a new reason for the threat, it does make sense. Yahweh was in covenant relationship with Israel that did not exist between him and Egypt or Gog. Whereas Israel should expect threats of non-burial for their disobedience based on Deuteronomy 28:26, no such expectation would have been present for Egypt or Gog. As with the Jeremiah passages, the Ezekiel passages give reason to question Hillers's conclusions as no passage in Ezekiel mentions all three of

his so-called typical categories together, and there is no reference to dung in the Ezekiel passages.

2.3.3.H - Zephaniah 1:17

Zep 1:17 וְהֵצַרְתִּי לָאָדָם וְהָלְכוּ כַּעִוְרִים כִּי לַיהוָה חָטָאוּ וְשֻׁפַּךְ דָּמָם כֶּעָפָר וּלְחֵמָם כַּגֻּלָלִים׃

"And I will cause distress to mankind, and they will walk as blind for to Yahweh they have sinned, and blood will be poured out as dust and their flesh as dung."

Abuse	Agent	Victim	Reason	Result
Flesh poured out as dung	Yahweh	Mankind	Sinning against the Lord	The destruction of all that is sinful

One could take Zephaniah 1:17 as either a threat of non-burial or only as a devaluation of the victims' lives. As non-burial and devaluation are not mutually exclusive, one should probably read the references to dust and dung as statements of being devalued by being left unburied. However, such an interpretation would make Zephaniah 1:17 the sole example of a threat of non-burial given exclusively in terms of being as dung. All oth-

er references to dung in non-burial threats also contain an explicit statement of non-burial.

2.3.4 - Summary and Conclusions Drawn from Analysis of Parallel Passages

As already noted, Hillers's conclusion regarding the three ways abuse is stereotypically found in non-burial passages[113] is an overstatement even if passages under consideration are limited to prophetic passages. While Mansen's critique of Hillers carries fundamental analytical flaws, she is right to challenge his description of the typical non-burial curse. However, non-burial is typically expressed in one (or more) of three ways, "(1) the body will be unburied; (2) it will be food for bird and beast; (3) it will be like refuse on the face of the earth."[114] Of the twenty-four passages examined, all contain at least one of Hillers's categories. Only eight passages contain more than one category of non-burial. Sixteen passages reference carrion animals (Gn 40:19, Dt 28:26, 1 Sm 17:43-44, 1 Sm 17:45-47, 1 Kgs 14:11, 1 Kgs 16:4, 1 Kgs 21:23-24, 2 Kgs 9:10, Jer 7:33-8:3, Jer 15:3, Jer 19:7, Jer 34:20, Ez 29:5, Ez 32:4-5, Ez 33:27, and Ez 39:4-5). Twelve give an explicit statement of non-burial (Lv

113. Ibid., 69.

114. Ibid.

26:29-30, 2 Kgs 9:10, Is 14:19-20, Jer 7:33-8:3, Jer 9:21, Jer 14:16, Jer 16:4, Jer 25:33, Ez 6:5, Ez 29:5, Ez 32:4-5, and Ez 39:4-5). Five passages speak of dung (Jer 7:33-8:3, Jer 9:21, Jer 16:4, Jer 25:33, Zep 1:17), and four of the five dung passages also make an explicit statement of non-burial. Being as refuse is the exclusive threat in only one passage (Zep 1:17). Explicit non-burial is the exclusive threat in four passages (Lv 26:29-30, Is 14:19-20, Jer 14:6, and Ez 6:5). Carrion-eating animals are the exclusive threat of non-burial in eleven passages (Gn 40:19. Dt 28:26, 1 Sm 17:43-44, 1 Sm 17:45-47, 1 Kgs 14:11, 1 Kgs 16:4, 1 Kgs 21:23-24, Jer 15:3, Jer 19:7, Jer 34:20, Ez 33:27).

Turning to Mansen's remaining four categories- agent, victim, reason, and result- one finds several points helpful in determining the presence or absence of a non-burial paradigm. In the twenty-four biblical passages considered, Yahweh is the agent of the abuse twenty-two times. Pharaoh is the agent in Genesis 40:19, and Goliath is the agent in 1 Samuel 17:43-44. Three passages (Gn 40:19, 1 Sm 17:43-44, and 2 Kgs 9:10) have an individual named as the victim. The remaining twenty-one passages have a collective as the victim. Fifteen of the twenty-one collective passages target Israel or some subset thereof. In addition to Israel, the Philistines (1 Sm 17:45-47), Babylon (Is 14:19-20), Egypt (Ez 29:5, 32:4-5), and humankind (Zep 1:17) are targeted by Yahweh with threats

of non-burial. The Philistines, Babylon, and Egypt receive threats of non-burial in the context of their standing against and/or harsh treatment of Israel. Given the social context of the threats of non-burial to the Philistines, Babylon, and Egypt, deliverance is introduced as a theme of specific non-burial threats. The Philistines, Egypt, and Gog are all threatened with carrion-devouring animals. One does not always find an explicit, intended result as a part of a threat of non-burial (see Gn 40:19). When an intended result is identified, it most often contains an ongoing degradation of the victim such as being forgotten, scorned, utterly desolated, or a combination of degradations. Nearly as frequently, the vindication of Yahweh or his laws is given as the intended result. Such vindication may be as general as "they will know that I am the Lord." Greater specificity may be in view, such as the land being able to enjoy the sabbaths prescribed by Yahweh.

In light of the data, one can draw the following pertinent conclusions about threats of non-burial in the Old Testament.

1. The threat of non-burial is most frequently, though certainly not exclusively, expressed in terms of birds and beasts feasting on the corpses of the victims in the Old Testament.

2. Carrion-eating animals are the most common stand-alone threat of non-burial in the Old Testament.
3. Being found on the lips of kings, warriors, and Yahweh, being connected to Yahweh and pagan gods, and targeting individuals, Israel, and other nations, carrion-eating animals are used as a threat in a greater variety of situations than any other non-burial threat in the Old Testament.
4. Old Testament threats of non-burial breathed out by non-Israelites are always expressed in terms of birds and beast feasting on the corpses of the victims.
5. When targeting non-Israelite collectives, threats of non-burial implied Yahweh's deliverance of Israel.
6. As it relates to our inquiries of the potential messianic function of the paradigmatic curse we see that judgement is a necessary part of the threat, Yahweh's agency is almost always in view, and Israel's redemption is implied in at least some cases.

The establishment of a general paradigm for announcing judgement leads to the second question, "To what extent can a common purpose be found in the judgement passages in view?" It is of course entirely possible that formulaic language was employed randomly, that is the formula

stopped with the language used. On the other hand, it is possible that such a paradigm was used with a common purpose.

2.4 - To what extent can a common purpose be found in the judgement passages in view?

While the paradigm of curse language was not as clear as Hillers asserted, and while each passage has particular emphases, one can tease out three themes which point to an overarching covenantal structure of the curses. First, in the passages examined and throughout the Old Testament, Yahweh is imminently concerned with the maintenance and administration of his covenants and covenant people, and the threats announced against Israel are typically framed in terms of covenant violation. Second, and very much related to Yahweh's covenantal presence, the threat of non-burial is frequently found in conjunction with the assertion that Yahweh has not been known and/or will be known as a result of the action (Jer 9:24; 15:6; 16:11-12, 21; 19:4; Ez 6:7; 29:6; 32:15; 33:29; 39:6-7). Third, when the threats of non-burial are directed against foreign nations such as the Philistines, Babylon, and Egypt the deliverance of Israel is in view as a result of the judgment on the nation(s) being condemned. This third point is strengthened with a closer examination of another feature of David's taunting speech.

2.4.1 - David's Fourth Curse Element - Yāda'

In addition to the language of non-burial, a final feature of David's threat deserves treatment. David's speech parallels Goliath's speech at every point until the very end where David adds the following as the divine motivation for Goliath's predicted defeat, "...and all the earth will know that there is a God for Israel. And all this assembly will know that Yahweh does not save with sword and spear for to Yahweh is the battle, and he will give you into our hands" (1 Sm 17:46b-47). The use of יָדַע (yāda'), 'to know', is rhetorically significant when Yahweh is the object of knowledge and when Yahweh is the one who knows his covenant people. David's two uses of yāda' in 1Samuel 17:46-47 fit the specified syntactical structure.

Herbert Huffmon offered a helpful examination of the use of yāda' in the Hebrew Bible, proposing a technical, covenantal use of yāda' that indicates "mutual legal recognition of the part of suzerain and vassal, i.e., Yahweh and his servant(s)."[115] He notes four different ways in which yāda' is used in the Hebrew Bible:

---

115. Herbert B. Huffmon, "The Treaty Background of Hebrew Yāda," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 181, (1966), 34.

1. "passages dealing with individuals 'known' in covenant with Yahweh;"[116]
2. "texts in which yāda' would seem to be used in reference to covenant recognition of Israel by Yahweh;"[117]
3. passages in which "yāda' refers to the vassal's 'knowing' the suzerain, i.e. to Israel's recognizing Yahweh as its (sole) legitimate God;"
4. "Yāda' is also used in connection with the change of heart and new covenant;"[118]

Huffmon's fourth category deserves some expansion for our purposes. A promised new covenant is spoken of in terms of the people of God knowing the Lord three times. Jeremiah writes, "I will give to them a heart to know me that I am Yahweh and they will be to me for a people, and I will be for them for a God because they will return to me with all their heart" (Jer 24:7). Later, in the context of the new covenant being formally announced we read, "They will not teach any longer each his friend and each his brother saying, 'Know Yahweh,' for all of them will

116. Ibid.

117. Ibid., 35.

118. Ibid., 36.

know me from the least of them to the greatest of them,' utters Yahweh" (Jer 31:34). Similarly, Ezekiel writes, "I will establish my covenant with you, and you will know that I am Yahweh" (Ez 16:62). These promises of a new covenant hold out eschatological hope for the people of God.

In addition to Huffmon's categories, one could add passages in which Yahweh makes himself known to a foreign party, particularly one interested in displacing Yahweh as Israel's suzerain. Throughout the story of the Exodus, the discussion hinges on who knows Yahweh. Pharaoh's response to Moses and Aaron's first request was, "And Pharaoh said, 'Who is Yahweh that I should hear his voice and let Israel go. I do not know Yahweh, and also Israel will not go" (Ex 5:2). As the story progresses, Yahweh makes clear that he will be known by both Israel and Egypt, and the context of the story makes clear that he is making himself known to both parties as Israel's true suzerain in place of Pharaoh. The goal of Moses's work in Egypt was to reveal Yahweh to the people of Israel as their suzerain based on his being the God of the Abrahamic covenant. Earlier, in Exodus 3, we read,

> And Moses said to God, "Behold when I come to the sons of Israel, and I say to them, 'The God of your fathers sent me to you,' and they say to me, 'What is his name?' What will I say to them?"

> And God said to Moses, "I am who I am." And he said, "Thus you will say to the sons of Israel, 'I am has sent me to you.'" God also said to Moses, "Thus you will say to the sons of Israel, 'Yahweh, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob sent me to you.' This is my name from everlasting, and this is my remembrance for all generations" (Ex 3:13-15).

Frequently, especially throughout Ezekiel, knowing the Lord is connected to the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel as Yahweh reintroduces himself by way of faithfully administering the curses of the covenant on his people who have violated the terms of the covenant. "My anger will be completed, and I will cause my wrath to rest on them. I will be comforted, and they will know that I am Yahweh - I have spoken in my jealousy - when I complete my wrath on them" (Ez 5:13). Additionally, as with Pharaoh in Exodus, Ezekiel speaks of nations opposing Israel such as Moab (Ez 25), Egypt (Ez 29, 32 et al.), Edom (Ez 35), and Gog (Ez 39) knowing the Lord through his judgement. When dealing with Gog, Ezekiel writes, "And I will send fire on Magog and on those dwelling securely in the coastlands, and they will know that I am Yahweh. And my holy name I will make known in the midst of my peo-

ple Israel, and my holy name will not be profaned again. And the nations will know that I am Yahweh, the holy One with Israel" (Ez 39:6-7).

Huffmon concludes

> In summary, it seems clear that the evidence does justify a claim that 'know' may be used as a technical term for (legal) recognition in international treaties and related texts. Furthermore, while some of the biblical evidence might be explained otherwise, it also seems clear that most of the passages cited above do come into sharper focus when understood in the light of technical treaty usage of words for 'know,' such as 'acknowledge, recognize (authority, claims)' in the usual legal sense.[119]

In addition to Huffmon's conclusions, one can note that when Yahweh makes himself known to foreign entities, it typically involves the deliverance of his people. Likewise, the future "making known" attached to the redemptive-covenant passages found in Jeremiah 24 and 31 and Ezekiel 16 point to an ultimate eschatological reality by which Yahweh makes himself known in a unique, redemptive manner. In so far as the judgements that are announced on the nations, even the early judgement events such as the Exodus, foreshadow the great, eschatological act of

119. Ibid., 37.

Yahweh making himself known to his people as their covenant God, we must find in these events a foretaste of the final, redemptive act of Yahweh making himself known to his people, establishing himself as their only and rightful suzerain. The deliverance of Israel, particularly in passages using yāda', is frequently announced in terms of Yahweh remembering (a different take on the covenantal "knowing" theme) his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. David's use of yāda' in the fourth element of his curse, which sets his taunt apart from Goliath's, requires that one take this technical and weighty use of yāda' into account when considering the meaning of both David's taunt and the narrative as a whole.

2.4.2 - Conclusions to the Extent of a Common Purpose

In answer to the present question of a common purpose in the judgement passages that have been considered, we can offer six conclusions highlighting the confidence one rightly has in finding a common purpose in the pertinent judgment passages.

1. Yahweh is imminently concerned with the maintenance and administration of his covenants and covenant people, and the threats an-

nounced against Israel are typically framed in terms of covenant violation.

2. The threat of non-burial is frequently found in conjunction with the assertion that Yahweh has not been known and/or will be known as a result of the action.

3. When the threats of non-burial are directed against foreign nations, the deliverance of Israel is in view as a result of the judgment on the nation(s) being condemned.

4. There is a technical, legal use of the term yāda' with which certain biblical uses comport.

5. When the technical, legal use of the term yāda' is invoked in the context of judgment on a foreign nation, the deliverance of Israel is also typically in view.

6. Within the judgement passages in view, there is often an eschatological reality.

7. Once again, Yahweh's agency, Israel's redemption, and the judgment of Yahweh's and/or Israel's foes, three pieces of Motyer's proposed

Old Testament Messianism are in view when considering the purpose of judgement passages that have been examined.

Having shown that there exists both a general paradigm for announcing judgement using non-burial language and that within such passages a common purpose can be found, we can now look more closely at the eschatological force of non-burial, judgement language.

2.5 - What is the eschatological force of non-burial, judgement language?

Having shown that there is both a common pattern and purpose to announcing judgement through the use of threats of non-burial and seeing that in part the common purpose touches on eschatological realities, it is appropriate to explore the force of such language. How exactly would the eschatological realities in non-burial threats of judgement be interpreted in their original context? This question is an essential step on the way to assessing how the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative is functioning.

2.5.1 - Personal Eschatology

The eschatological force of non-burial, judgement language is two-fold. On the one hand, there is a personal, eschatological component to being left unburied. Elizabeth Bloch-Smith has identified active "cult of the dead" beliefs and practices in ancient Israel.[120] "Cult of the dead" can encompass a rather broad range of meanings that includes both a simple belief in the afterlife and highly developed beliefs and practices surrounding the death and burial experience. On the one hand, the concern for proper burial because of its effect on the afterlife could be included. On the other hand, insuring not only that the deceased not be left to the carrion animals (for example) but also that they have in their deceased possession whatever gifts and tools might be necessary for safe and successful passage into the afterlife is rightly included in a cult of the dead. For her purposes, Block-Smith uses a rather broad definition stating, "The belief in the empowered dead, with the attendant practices stemming from that belief, is here interpreted as a cult of the dead."[121]

120.Elizabeth M Bloch-Smith, "The Cult of the Dead in Judah: Interpreting the Material Remains," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111, no. 2 (1992): 213-224.

121.Ibid., 213.

While some of the beliefs and practices connected with the cult of the dead seem clearly to be outside the bounds of fidelity to Yahweh and his law, one must be careful not to classify all such beliefs and practices as mere pagan, ritualistic practices within Israel. Joseph was concerned for his burial and made the Israelites swear that when God visited them and moved them on from Egypt, they would take his bones and bury them in the land he had promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Gn 50:24). Far from pagan ritualism, one must interpret Joseph's dying wish as an act of faithfulness stemming from his confidence in God's covenant promises. Furthermore, Yahweh himself included non-burial judgement language in his list of curses for covenant disobedience stating such covenant curses "will be against you for a sign and for a wonder with your seed forever" (Dt 28:46). The non-burial was the sign that one had been abandoned by Yahweh both now and in the eschaton. While the rhetoric of non-burial both in the cult of the dead and the Deuteronomic curses have the same effect, the cult of the dead burial beliefs often saw non-burial as the mechanism of being abandoned in the afterlife whereas the covenant curse of non-burial served as a sign that you had been or would be so abandoned. The personal function of the curse is seen at work in the passages in which Yahweh deals with individuals or an individual and their house (e.g. 1 Kgs 14:11; 16:4; 21:23-24; and 2 Kgs 9:10).

2.5.2 - Corporate Eschatology

On the other hand, in so far as the covenant between Yahweh and the people of Israel dealt with Israel corporately as a theocracy, there is not only a personal eschatological component but also a corporate eschatological component to the curse of non-burial when it is announced on the people corporately. While there is always a faithful remnant within Israel (e.g. Joshua and Caleb among the spies and the 7,000 in 1 Kgs 19) even these "knees who have not bowed to Baal" (1 Kgs 19:18), and their faithful offspring are unable to escape the curses Yahweh brings on Israel for their sin. The corporate application of the curses of Deuteronomy has the same eschatological implications of abandonment by Yahweh at a corporate level as those announced against individuals. However, reading the curses of Deuteronomy 28 in their own broader context, one finds that the faithful application of these curses sets the stage for the great covenantal reversal announced in Deuteronomy 30, which breaks the warning narrative with a glimpse forward to a time when the curses will have come upon Israel and Yahweh will gather those who have been scattered, circumcise their hearts, to the effect that they will love Yahweh their God with all their heart and with all their soul (Dt 30:6). In

other words, they will once again "know" Yahweh. Craigie,[122] Tigay,[123] and Christensen[124] all point out the chiastic structure and hyper use of שׁוּב found in Deuteronomy 30:1-10 bringing emphasis to a future time when Israel will have failed but their God will bring repentance and restoration.

2.5.3 - Eschatological Conclusions

Reading the covenant curses of Deuteronomy 28 in this eschatological light introduces a layer of both eschatological fear and hope not only to Deuteronomy 28 but also to the later reiterations of the Deuteronomic curses found in the prophets including the curse of non-burial and carrion consumption found in Deuteronomy 28:26 and repeated throughout the prophets. In so far as judgement is being pronounced on Israel

---

122.Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, ed. R.K. Harrison and Robert L. Hubbard Jr., The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eaerdmans Publishing Co., 1976), 362ff..

123.Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, ed. Nahum M. Sarna, The Jps Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 283ff..

124.Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, David Allen Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 6B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2002), 732ff..

through the use of non-burial judgement language as a result of her infidelity, eschatological fear is being announced. In so far as a permanent judgement is being announced on the enemies of Israel, both at an individual and at a corporate level, through the use of non-burial, judgement language, a future, eschatological hope is being announced for Israel.

With a paradigm for announcing judgement with a common purpose that includes an eschatological component established, we now return to the David and Goliath narrative to assess whether the use of such language between David and Goliath can be classified with other such passages or if it stands apart from them.

2.6 - To what extent can the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative, 1 Samuel 17:43-47, be classified with judgement passages sharing similar language?

The taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative exhibits both continuity and discontinuity with the parallel passages; however, the context of the passage in view gives the reader reason to interpret the pre-battle curses in a similar manner to the prophetic passages rather than as an anomalous use of curse language as is found in Genesis 40:19.

2.6.1 - Discontinuities between Non-burial Threat in 1 Samuel 17 and Similar Passages

The primary discontinuity between 1 Samuel 17:43-47 and the other parallel passages is the immediate historical setting. The words shared between David and Goliath occur on the battlefield as precursors to the ensuing fight. In no other instance in the Hebrew Bible is the curse put to use during war. Second, the curse is part of a back-and-forth exchange between Israel's representative and the Philistine champion. While there are examples of enemies talking on the battlefield (cf. 2 Kgs 18:19-37), this type of tit-for-tat exchange of words between enemies is not attested elsewhere in the Old Testament. Third, David's words to Goliath are the only use of the curse directed at the Philistines. Finally, unlike the prophets who were sent by Yahweh to announce the curse, there is no record of David being sent to the Philistine with any message from Yahweh.

2.6.2 - Continuities between Non-burial Threats in 1 Samuel 17 and Similar Passages

While there are significant discontinuities between the use of the curse in 1 Samuel 17 and similar passages, there are also significant continuities, both in the curse itself and in the broader context. Perhaps the most

significant continuity is David's declaration that by the threatened actions Israel and all nations would know Yahweh. As has already been discussed, "knowing" Yahweh as Israel's suzerain is a frequent motivation for such a curse. Second, there are syntactical and lexical continuities between the curses as well. Both David and Goliath use standard Hebrew lexemes for birds and beasts. The majority of passages surveyed both reference carrion animals and use them as the exclusive threat in the curse. Third, just as the Egyptians and Gog were targeted collectively, the Philistines collectively are the target of David's threat. Fourth, although David was not explicitly sent to the Philistines by Yahweh with a threatening message, David presents Yahweh as the one who will accomplish the threat.

One finds further points of continuity when one examines the broader context of the David and Goliath taunt. We note that the threat comes in the context of literary uncertainty regarding who Israel's suzerain is. Within the David and Goliath narrative, Goliath is seeking to broker a deal whereby Israel would be servants to the Philistines. According to Eaton, the type of trash talk found between David and Goliath was at times used to establish covenant terms.[125] There is a real sense in which the actions of Goliath are an affront to Yahweh, Israel's suzerain. David

125. Eaton, “Instances of Flyting”, 8.

seems to recognize the reality of the situation immediately upon hearing Goliath's daily speech, and his response is one of bewilderment as he wonders why an uncircumcised Philistine is being allowed to defy Yahweh and his armies (1 Sm 17:26).

In addition to the immediate context in which the Philistine is challenging the suzerainty of Yahweh, one must bear in mind the story of David and Goliath is part of a broader narrative involving both Israel's rejection of Yahweh as their king (1 Sm 8:7) and Saul's unfaithful actions for which Yahweh rejected him as king (1 Sm 13-15). While numerous questions remain open regarding the proposed narrative cycles of Samuel and Kings, how these narratives came to be presented in their final form as one story, and the precise genre of both the narratives and the work as a whole, it is inarguable that as the text exists in its final form, by 1 Samuel 17, the redactor has brilliantly woven together a story that raises significant questions regarding both the divine suzerain of Israel and his earthly counterpart. These are questions to which David offers a definitive answer in his final words to Goliath, "all the earth will know that there is a God for Israel. And all this assembly will know that Yahweh does not save with sword or with spear for to Yahweh is the battle and he will give you into our hands" (1 Sm 17:46b-47).

2.6.3 - Classification of 1 Samuel 17:43-47 Conclusions

The points of continuity support a strong, rhetorical correlation between the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative and the parallel passages. As noted by both Rofé and McCarter, there is a robust eschatological force attached to the judgement language particularly when focused on Yahweh asserting his covenantal authority, securing his people against ongoing threats of foreign nations, and promising the deliverance of his people.[126] Therefore, one can say regarding the David and Goliath passages what has already been said regarding the prophetic passages. Just as the proposed reading of Deuteronomy 28 introduces a layer of eschatological hope to the later reiterations of the Deuteronomic curses found in the prophets, so too one finds in the taunting language of David and Goliath a testimony to the eschatological hope of Israel. David is being presented, or presenting himself, as the answer to Hannah's prayer in 1 Samuel 2:10, a passage on which we will focus later, and as the one who will bring the judgement of Yahweh on the enemies of Israel so that they can live in blessing. Such a presentation of David as the fulfillment of Hannah's prayer is in accord with the various statements concerning David as the one whom God has chosen as king (1Sm 13:14; 15:28; 16:1, 12-13; 2Sm 2:1-4; 5:1-2, 10; 7:1-17). In so far as the taunting lan-

126.Rofé, “The Battle,”, 144. and McCarter Jr., *Samuel*, 294-297.

guage of 1 Samuel 17:43-47 can be classified with judgment passages sharing similar language and is a story of the victory that Yahweh works through his chosen king and by which deliverance is brought to Israel, judgement is executed on the Philistines, and dominion over the Philistines is accomplished to the end that "all the earth will know that there is a God for Israel," it is certainly plausible, if not correct, to read this story in light of Old Testament Messianism.

2.7 - Chapter Conclusions

After examining language typical of scenes of non-burial, we were able to show that a general paradigm for announcing judgement through threats of non-burial, and specifically threats employing carrion-eating animals can be identified. The non-burial language of carrion-eating animals appears more frequently as a stand-alone threat in the Old Testament than any other type of threat. Such language was used throughout Scripture to announce both divine judgment and deliverance of Israel from her enemies. The relationship of this non-burial language to the similar Deuteronomic curses introduces an aspect of eschatological hope for the people of God by connecting the judgement announced on her enemies with the curses Yahweh said he would bring on the enemies of

his people when he gathered them in again after scattering them. The eschatological force introduced by such language functions on both an individual and corporate level and is clearly at play in the David and Goliath narrative. Further, a growing case is being made for the presence of messianic themes in the presentation of David as Yahweh's chosen king through whom he delivered Israel from the Philistines, first announcing judgement on them and then conquering them. Such conclusions set the stage for an exploration of how similar rhetorical language was used throughout the Ancient Near East.

3 - Chapter 3: The Rhetoric of the David and Goliath Narrative in Its Canonical and Social Context

3.1 - Literature Review

The contextual questions surrounding the David and Goliath narrative are nearly as complicated as the textual issues. One cannot even consider how 1 Samuel 17 relates to 1 Samuel 16 without encountering significant questions of chronology which have weighty implications for the rhetorical function of the David and Goliath narrative. Did Samuel know David or not? If so, why is he asking about the shepherd boy's identity? If not, what is the purpose of the non-chronological arrangement of the material? As the context is broadened, questions are only further complicated as one must consider such issues as the possibility of the influence of texts from diverse settings, the anthropological overlap of cultures, historic military practices and their possible rhetorical function, genre comparisons, and various other issues. Each of these issues has generated monumental amounts of thoughtful scholarship.

3.1.1 - Biblical Context

The many 1 Samuel commentaries have amply addressed and summarized the conclusions to the questions regarding the immediate context of 1 Samuel 17. Explanations can be placed in two broad categories: rhetorical and harmonious. Rhetorical explanations work from the position that the various sources with differing histories were brought together with little or no necessary mind for harmony in order to make a rhetorical point about David. Not all see the same rhetorical point being made. Harmonious explanations, by some means or another, seek to harmonize the accounts.

Trying to discern the next layer of the canonical context of 1 Samuel 17 vaults one into numerous discussions at once. Alongside questions of addressing the immediate contextual layers, one enters the grand discussion surrounding the composition of the Samuel-Kings corpus and more broadly the Deuteronomistic History. The compositional questions of Samuel-Kings were brought to significance by the work of Leonard Rost[127] whose original proposal of a distinct "ark narrative" and "succes-

127.Leonhard Rost, *The Succession to the Throne of David*, trans. David Gunn, Bloomsbury Academic Collections: Biblical Studies (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015-01-29).

sion narrative" within Samuel-Kings led to further identification of two more distinct sections in 1 and 2 Samuel, the "Saul Cycle" and "History of David's Rise." Debates surrounding the validity and limits of proposed pre-canonical narrative sources has focused most recently on the "succession narrative" as seen in the work of Blenkinsopp[128] and Van Seters.[129] Discussions of these proposed narrative sections in 1 Samuel and their interpretive relationship are also tied to Noth's Deuteronomistic History[130] proposal and the subsequent variations and challenges to this theory. As the discussion of the Deuteronomistic History advanced, scholars tended to follow either Cross[131] and his pre/post-exilic redaction proposal or scholars such as Rudolf Smend[132] and the proposal of multi-

---

128. Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Another Contribution to the Succession Narrative Debate (2 Samuel 11-20; 1 Kings 1-2)," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, no. 1 (2013): 35-58.

129. John Van Seters, "A Revival of the Succession Narrative and the Case Against it," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 39, no. 1 (2014): 3-14.

130. Martin Noth, "The Deuteronomistic History," *Journal for the Study of the Old Supplement ...* 15, (1991).

131. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997).

132. Rudolf Smend, "The Law and the Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History," in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies in the Deuteronomistic History,* ed. Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville, (Winona

ple post-exilic redactions of an originally post-exilic work. As scholars have continued to push in this direction the question has become, "To what degree can pre-deuteronomistic sources be identified, and how does the possible origin of such sources affect the interpretation of the sources as found in their final canonical form?"

While some scholars have sought to identify the "real history" behind figures such as David,[133] others have sought to continue somewhat in the vein of Noth and are less interested in either identifying the limits of unique sources, redactors, or the "real history" behind the biblical text and trying to understand how the text is functioning. To be sure, such work is not necessarily a rejection of the presence of sources, redactors, and crafted history. Mendenhall[134] began weighing the influence of Hittite treaty structures on the covenants of the Old Testament and many

---

Lake, IN: Eisenbrans, 2000).

133.See Steven L. McKenzie, *King David: A Biography* (Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press, 2001). and Baruch Halpern, *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2004).

134.George E. Mendenhall, "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 17, no. 2 (1954): 26-46. and George E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 17, no. 3 (1954): 50-76.

others, such as Fensham[135] and Weinfeld,[136] have followed suit exploring the specific ways in which Ancient Near Eastern treaty language informs our understanding of biblical covenants and the blessings and curses contained therein. This discussion of the influence of covenant in the Ancient Near Eastern culture would indeed bear significant influence on the interpretation of the David and Goliath narrative if the elements in view could be linked to covenant making and keeping practices in the Ancient Near East.

135.F. Charles Fensham, "Malediction and Benediction in Ancient Near Eastern Vassal-Treaties and the Old Testament," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 74, no. 1 (1962): 1-9.; F. Charles Fensham, "Clauses of Protection in Hittite Vassal-Treaties and the Old Testament," *Vetus Testamentum* 13, no. Fasc. 2 (1963): 133-143.; and F. Charles Fensham, "Common Trends in Curses of the Near Eastern Treaties and Kudurru-Inscriptions Compared With Maledictions of Amos and Isaiah," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 75, no. 2 (1963): 155-175.

136.Moshe Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1970): 184-203.; Moshe Weinfeld, "Covenant Terminology in the Ancient Near East and Its Influence on the West," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1973): 190-199.; and Moshe Weinfeld, "Ancient Near Eastern Patterns in Prophetic Literature," *Vetus Testamentum* 27, no. Fasc. 2 (1977): 178-195.

3.1.2 - Extra-biblical Context

In considering these broader questions of the social context of Scripture in general and the David and Goliath narrative in particular, one must consider the broader literary context which forces not only questions of genre, date, and provenance but also questions of cross-cultural literary dependence of the text in order to get at the questions of the extent of literary and anthropological influence across Ancient Near Eastern cultures on the David and Goliath narrative. The scholarly consensus regarding the question of genre are best represented by Weiser[137] and McCarter's[138] work on the "history of David's rise" as an apologetic, as defined by Hoffner,[139] for David as the rightful king of Israel. McCarter writes, "Its purpose is to show that David's accession to the throne was lawful and that the events leading up to his proclamation as king over all Israel were guided by the will of the god of Israel."[140] He goes on to compare the

---

137. Artur Weiser, "Die Legitimation Des Königs David: Zur Eigenart Und Entstehung Der Sogen. Geschichte Von Davids Aufstieg," *Vetus Testamentum* (1966): 325-354.

138. McCarter Jr., "The Apology".

139. Harry A. Hoffner, "Propaganda and Political Justification in Hittite Historiography," ed. Hans Goedicke and Jimmy Jack MacBee Roberts, Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975).

140. McCarter Jr., "The Apology", 495.

"history of David's rise" to the apology of Hattushilish III. McCarter's position has been challenged by Short[141], who questions not only the legitimacy of the varied definitions of the History of David's Rise but also how the genre of this section of 1 Samuel is assigned. He concludes, "I suggest that it was composed and transmitted for the sake of shaping and reflecting the identity of YHWH's, and Israel's, beloved son--the figure of David and each of his 'sons' to inherit his throne--and, consequently, that of YHWH's people, whom David embodies."[142] Subsequently, Knapp has issued an interesting, critical response to Short on the basis that, "Short treats apologetic as a literary genre, when in fact it should be viewed as a rhetorical genre."[143]

In addition to the search for Ancient Near Eastern analogues for the History of David's Rise, scholars have sought more precise narrative comparisons with the David and Goliath narrative in both Ancient Near Eastern and ancient Greek sources by focusing on particular issues found in 1 Samuel 17 such as single combat and non-burial curses. Gor-

---

141. J. Randall Short, *The Surprising Election and Confirmation of King David*, ed. Francois Brown, Francis Schussler Firorenza, and Peter B. Machinist, Harvard Theoloigcal Studies, vol. 63 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010).

142. Ibid., 196.

143. Andrew Knapp, “David and Hattushili Iii: The Impact of Genre and a Response to J. Randall Short,” *Vetus Testamentum* 63, no. 2 (2013): 261-275.

don,[144] Hoffner,[145] DeVaux,[146] and Frolov and Wright[147] find potential single combat parallels in ancient Greek, Egyptian, Babylonian, and Hittite sources. Not all agree on which episodes qualify as single, or representative, combat, but it is the consensus that single combat was a practice throughout the ancient world to the end of avoiding "the necessity of a general engagement of troops which would spill more blood than necessary to resolve the dispute."[148] In these discussions, Hoffner's careful approach to what qualifies as single combat is quite helpful as he notes a few episodes commonly used as analogues of the representative combat between David and Goliath are fights between two persons to settle a personal issue but not representative. It is this care that is needed when seeking to understand the weight one should give to the broad context of any literary work.

---

144. Cyrus H. Gordon, "Homer and Bible: The Origin and Character of East Mediterranean Literature," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 26, (1955): 43-108.

145. Harry A. Hoffner Jr, "A Hittite Analogue to the David and Goliath Contest of Champions," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (1968): 220-225.

146. Roland de Vaux, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, trans. Damian McHugh, First American ed. (London: Doubleday, 1972).

147. Serge Frolov and Allen Wright, "Homeric and Ancient Near Eastern Intertextuality in 1 Samuel 17," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130, no. 3 (2011).

148. Hoffner Jr, "Hittite Analogue", 220.

Various forms of corpse desecration and abuse were common in the Ancient Near East. Much of the research touching on corpse abuse is found in works focused on broader questions of beliefs and practices surrounding death, burial, and the afterlife and are interdisciplinary works, considering the issues from archaeological, anthropological, political, rhetorical, and various other perspectives. While there is some debate between scholars regarding the details of particular aspects of the beliefs and practices surrounding death and burial in the Ancient Near East (e.g. To what extent was there a "cult of the dead" among the Israelites?), there is a tremendous amount of scholarly agreement regarding the general shape of beliefs and practices regarding death and burial throughout the Ancient Near East. The areas of agreement include the overlap of beliefs and practices, the rhetorical import of the use of death and burial in Ancient Near Eastern history and literature, and the interpretive insight such beliefs and practices bring to the biblical text. Hillers[149] work on the subject still carries weight 40 years later. As mentioned above, Mansen[150] built on Hillers work with a critique that he did not go far

149. Hillers, “Treaty-Curses”.

150. Mansen, “Desecrated Covenant”.

enough. Gevirtz,[151] Brichto,[152] Childs,[153] Smith,[154] Bloch-Smith,[155]

151. Stanley Gevirtz, "Curse Motifs in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East" (University of Chicago, 1959). see also Stanley Gevirtz, "West-Semitic Curses and the Problem of the Origins of Hebrew Law," *Vetus Testamentum* 11, no. Fasc. 2 (1961): 137-158.

152. Herbert Chanan Brichto, "Kin, Cult, Land and Afterlife—a Biblical Complex," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44, (1973): 1-54.

153. Brevard S. Childs, "Death and Dying in Old Testament Theology," in *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East. Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope,* ed. John H. Marks and Robert M. Good, (Guilford, CT: Four Quarters, 1987).

154. Mark S Smith and Elizabeth M Bloch-Smith, "Review: Death and Afterlife in Ugarit and Israel," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108, no. 2 (1988): 277-284.

155. Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, *Judahite Burial Practices and Beliefs About the Dead* (A&C Black, 1992). Bloch-Smith, "Cult of the Dead".

Cross,[156] Olyan,[157] Lemos,[158] Hays,[159] Stavrakopoulou,[160] Pace,[161] and numerous others have produced other valuable works pertaining to the questions at hand. While each of these scholars has made helpful contributions to the discussion, of particular interest are Gevirtz, Bloch-Smith, Stavrakopoulou, and Lamb.

---

156. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*.

157. Saul M. Olyan, "Some Neglected Aspects of Israelite Interment Ideology," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124, no. 4 (2005): 601-616.

158. T.M. Lemos, "Shame and Mutilation of Enemies in the Hebrew Bible," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125, no. 2 (2006): 225-241.

159. Christopher B. Hays, *Death in the Iron Age Ii and in First Isaiah*, Forschungen Zum Alten Testament, vol. 79 (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

160. Francesca Stavrakopoulou, "Exploring the Garden of Uzza: Death, Burial and Ideologies of Kingship," *Biblica* (2006): 1-21. Francesca Stavrakopoulou, "Gog's Grave and the Use and Abuse of Corpses in Ezekiel 39: 11–20," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129, no. 1 (2010): 67-84. Francesca Stavrakopoulou, "Making Bodies: On Body Modification and Religious Materiality in the Hebrew Bible," *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 2, no. 4 (2013): 532-553.

161. Carl Elliot Pace, "Over My Dead Body: Desecration of the Dead and the Afterlife in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel" (Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, 2015).

3.1.2.A - Specific Contributions of Gevirtz

In his dissertation, Gevirtz offered numerous categories of curse type, theme, and formulation in the Ancient Near Eastern setting, examining how each category functioned in its social setting. He examined curse type under two main categories, "anticipatory" and "retributive" which "may be distinguished based on their employment either as a protection against, or in retaliation for a specific action."[162] Each of these curse types is analyzed both across Ancient Near Eastern cultural settings and attending circumstances of particular curses such as state, legal, and personal. Gevirtz notes that while there is a common use of anticipatory curse types across the Ancient Near East, "Among the retributive curse types none are attested in all or even most of the cultural areas of the ancient world."[163] In addition to the two curse types, Gevirtz outlines three categories of curse themes- fertility, sovereignty, and salubrity- each having two sub-categories. Finally, Gevirtz distinguishes between formulations of divine and non-divine agency.

While Gevirtz does not necessarily offer his types, themes, and formulations as hermetically sealed realities, it is helpful if one begins by assum-

---

162. Gevirtz, “Curse Motifs”, 10.

163. Ibid., 118.

ing a curse fits a particular category of type, theme, and formulation rather than softening the distinctions of the categories to give undue, broad-spectrum weight to a particular curse. Nonetheless, one must also acknowledge the close link between governments and the gods in the Ancient Near East. Concerning the link between government and the gods in Mesopotamia, Gevirtz writes, "Just as the royal office was held to have been resident in heaven whence it descended and was divinely bestowed, so too the appurtenances by which it was symbolized, the crown, scepter and throne, were held to have had a heavenly origin..."[164] While the exact formulation of the relationship between the king of Israel and Yahweh may differ from that of the Mesopotamian relationship, one cannot ignore the intersection of government and God in Israel when considering the use of curses in the Biblical text.

3.1.2.B - Specific Contributions of Bloch-Smith

Bloch-Smith examines archaeological, and biblical evidence of the presence of a cult of the dead within ancient Israel, concluding, "Both archaeological and biblical evidence attest to a cult of the dead in Judah, functioning in Jerusalem as well as in the hinterlands, throughout the

164.Ibid., 140-141.

monarchic period."[165] She goes on to interact with the various biblical passages governing practices frequently associated with the cult of the dead, acknowledging that while there was an apparent practice of caring for the dead in line with such cults, there are also frequent scriptural warnings against such practices. Bloch-Smith's works are a valuable reminder that Israel's practice of her theology was not always as pure as the presentation of her theology, a point that must be taken into consideration when considering threat passages such as those found in the David and Goliath narrative. Given Bloch-Smith's cogent argument regarding the existence of cult of the dead practices in ancient Israel, one must consider whether David is making threats in this light.

3.1.2.C - Specific Contributions of Stavrakopoulou

Stavrakopoulou has produced several articles that prove helpful in understanding the potential, rhetorical force of corpse abuse. Her articles are particularly helpful in that they examine not only the body at death or more specifically abuse of corpses but also the role the body played in religious practice throughout the Ancient Near East. As one example, Stavrakopoulou points to the practice of circumcision arguing, "Contrary

165. Bloch-Smith, “Cult of the Dead”, 213.

to certain theological interpretations, the circumcised penis is not merely a ‘symbol’ or ‘sign’ pointing to an implicitly immaterial or non-material theological or ideological construct; it is the very medium of religious meaning-making and renders the body fit for the ‘male’ performativity of religious activity (Gn 17:14; Ex 12:43 – 48; Jer 9:25)."[166] She goes on to point out the Old Testament's implicit recognition of the role body modification played in religious roles by noting its forbidding of practices associated with other, non-biblical religions[167] before going on to examine less permanent body modifications a such as adornment[168] and concluding, "The body thus not only shapes religious beliefs and practices, but brings them into being."[169] While one could challenge various aspects of Stavrakopoulou's interpretation of the biblical data, she sufficiently proves the importance of the use of the body for religious functionality among the Israelites.

In addition to the role of the living body in Israelite practice, Stavrakopoulou examined the role of the corpse in Israelite practice against the backdrop of the Ancient Near Eastern context. This current

166. Stavrakopoulou, “Making Bodies”, 535.

167. Ibid., 536.

168. Ibid., 539ff.

169. Ibid., 552.

research benefits especially from her work on Ezekiel 39:11-20 as we have already identified the Ezekiel passage as an analogue to the curse language in 1 Samuel 17 and as it pertains to Yahweh's judgement of a foreign king. In this article, she argues,

> The use and abuse of corpses is a powerful trope in biblical texts, extending well beyond the literary imaging of destruction and death to index instead a complex of socio-religious, political, and cultural concerns about the placement, treatment, and status of the dead among the living. As several socio-anthropological and ritual studies have shown, the ways in which the living respond to and deal with a corpse are not simply a matter of disposing of the dead. Rather, the methods and means of dealing with a corpse constitute a process effecting and maintaining the transformation of the deceased from a social person into a nonliving entity, enabling the living community to negotiate and reframe their relationship with that individual.[170]

Stavrakopoulou's thorough examination of the functionality of the body and the "use and abuse of corpses"[171] pushes one to explore the potential far-reaching rhetorical effects of threats of non-burial such as found in

---

170. Stavrakopoulou, “Gog’s Grave”, 67.

171. Ibid.

the David and Goliath narrative. There is not only the immediate impact on the one to whom the threat is made but also the potential impact on the society around the one threatened, especially if there are socio-political aspects attached to the situation. She writes,

> The devouring of corpses thus functions in the Hebrew Bible as a type of conceptual shorthand, representing a complex of ideas about the social abandonment of the dead. On one level, the scavenging of corpses by animals and birds signals an absence of the living community to care for the dead and to facilitate their transition into a postmortem existence through repeated mortuary rites... But while some forms of corpse mutilation and exposure are often presented in biblical and nonbiblical material as the deliberate inversion of normative mortuary practices, the devouring of corpses by scavengers functions on another level by going beyond inversion to signal more strongly alienation from society and thus the total abandonment of the dead. Indeed, to be devoured by animals and birds marks the uncontrolled, unregulated loss and disposal of the dead.[172]

172. Ibid., 74-75.

3.1.2.D - Specific Contributions of Lamb

Finally, David T. Lamb offers the most thorough examination of trash talking in 1 Samuel 17 specifically. In his work, he interacts with the multiple examples of trash talking throughout Scripture and the Ancient Near East.[173] Lamb is considering trash talking more broadly considered and understood than the present study. "Trash talking was often used in military contests as a means of psychological warfare, and it could involve three components: (1) insults that ridicule an enemy, (2) boasts that exalt the speaker, their country, or their gods; and (3) predictions of victory by the speaker over the opponent."[174] While the curse language of the David and Goliath narrative certainly fits Lamb's criteria, many other examples would as well. Lamb's broad definition of trash talk limits what he can say to more broad statements about the potential psychological impact on the target of the trash talk.

3.2 - Chapter 3 Questions

Chapter 2 was concerned with the existence of biblical parallels to the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative and how the func-

---

173.Lamb, “Trash Talking,”

174.Ibid., 112.

tion of these parallels informed our understanding of taunting language found in the David and Goliath narrative. The goal of asking such questions is to explore whether the taunting language of 1 Samuel 17 might serve as a key to understanding both how the David and Goliath narrative is functioning within the text of Samuel and by possible extension how the Samuel narrative in its final form is functioning. While chapter 2 concluded that a general paradigm for announcing divine judgement and even introducing eschatological hope through the threat of non-burial does exist, the Old Testament's dependence on Ancient Near Eastern literature and literary patterns at various points raises the question of possible literary parallels between the David and Goliath narrative and other Ancient Near Eastern literature. Chapter 3 will address two questions to this end.

1. What parallels, if any, can be found between the David and Goliath Narrative (and more broadly the History of David's Rise) and Ancient Near Eastern literature?

2. How are these parallels functioning in their respective contexts?

3.3 - What parallels, if any, can be found between the David and Goliath Narrative (and more broadly the History of David's Rise) and Ancient Near Eastern literature?

The existing research touching on the use of the curse of non-burial in the David and Goliath narrative and the Ancient Near East reveals at least two critical levels of context: 1) linguistic parallels and 2) narrative parallels. The former is self-explanatory. Are there Ancient Near Eastern texts wherein the corpses of enemies are left to various animals (e.g. dogs, birds, beasts) as food? The latter, narrative parallels, is somewhat broader and seeks to identify narratives and narrative settings parallel to the David and Goliath narrative (e.g. single-combat, representative combat, divine-combat, apology).

3.3.1 - Linguistic Parallels

Scholars have frequently noted the prominence of references to non-burial and its rhetorical function in various Ancient Near Eastern sources. As with the biblical data, not all non-burial references are created equal. While non-burial may be used in a variety of ways, the present question is concerned mainly with anticipatory[175] threats of non-burial rather than

175.Gevirtz, “Curse Motifs”, 10.

reports of retributive[176] or even incidental non-burial. Of course, the reporting of the non-burial of enemies in public documents, whether as retribution or simply as an incidental act of war, may serve a very similar purpose to the anticipatory threat; therefore, they still hold some value in that they can be used as de facto threats. Nonetheless, for the present research, only those parallel passages functioning as curses will be examined.

Further, not all threats of non-burial involve the enemies being given to carrion-eating animals. As seen above in our examination of biblical threats of non-burial, and as pointed out in Mansen, "the non-burial motif is not formulaic"[177] in a strict, linguistic sense. In light of the various uses of threats of non-burial and various components of such threats, it is essential to note that the current research is concerned most specifically with the anticipatory threat of non-burial involving carrion-eating animals. Only those Ancient Near Eastern passages using non-burial via carrion-eating animals as curses that are anticipatory threats will be examined.

176.Ibid.

177.Mansen, “Desecrated Covenant”, 165.

3.3.1.A - Threats of Non-Burial and Carrion-Eating Animals

While one finds countless anticipatory curses in virtually all Ancient Near Eastern treaties, examples of feeding a corpse to wild animals being used as a threat are few and far between. Indeed, in the corpus of Hebrew Scripture, one finds more examples of carrion-eating animals used as a threat than are easily found in the many extant Ancient Near Eastern works. Such scarcity, perhaps, is not surprising if, as was argued above, this treatment was considered extreme and so was reserved for particular violations of authority or contract. Two notable examples are found in the Maqlu tablets and The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon.

3.3.1.A.i - The Maqlu Tablets

The Maqlu Tablets are a wildly fascinating collection of incantations and rituals designed to ward off witches. Tzvi Abusch argues, "Maqlu actually represents a consecutive and unified ceremony in which the incantations were recited and the rituals performed in the order given therein, and the ritual tablet, far from being a simple catalogue, is in fact the manual for the complete ceremony."[178] The Maqlu tablets open with an

178. Tzvi Abusch, “Mesopotamian Anti-Witchcraft Literature: Texts and Studies Part I:

invocation of the deities to overcome the magic of the sorcerers. In the introductory tablet, questions of authority are presumed as the gods are called on to help the victims of the evil magic. The incantations found in the later tablets contain two threats of being consumed by wild animals. Though the text of tablet VIII is somewhat fragmented, it is clear from the extant portions of the text that the witch's body is to be fed to the wild animals.[179]

Maqlu VIII 81-89

May eagle and vulture prey on your corpse,

May silence and shivering fall upon you,

May dog and bitch tear you apart,

May dog and bitch tear apart your flesh."[180]

The Nature of Maqlû: Its Character, Divisions, and Calendrical Setting," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 33, no. 2 (1974), 252.

179.Tzvi Abusch, *Mesopotamian Witchcraft: Towards a History and Understanding of Babylonian Witchcraft Beliefs and Literature*, Ancient Magic and Divination, vol. 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 230.

180.Ibid.

Later, in the ninth tablet, a similar threat is made. However, this time around, a "dough figurine of the warlock and the witch" is fed to the dogs.

> You (the priest) make two loaves of bread and one dough figurine each of the warlock and witch; you then arrange (them) in the loaves; he (the patient) then raises up (the loaves) in his right and left hands and recites the incantations; you then give (them) to a dog and a bitch (Maqlu IX 183-187).[181]

The threat of not only non-burial but also of animals consuming the bodies is intended to indicate the utter destruction of the body so that there is no possibility of burial. The inclusion of these incantations at the closing of the tablets may indicate that there is no time for the bodies to be buried even if something was left.[182] The goal of these threats seems to be showing that the power struggle is being brought to an end. The evil beings have no authority or ability to continue their subversive work.

---

181. Ibid.

182. Ibid.

3.3.1.A.ii - The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon

One finds similar threats in the Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon. Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, wrote this treaty for the expressed purpose of securing the people's allegiance to his son, Ashurbanipal, in the event of the former's death.

> (This is) the treaty which Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, has established with you before the great gods of heaven and earth, on behalf of the crown prince designate Ashurbanipal the son of your lord Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, who has designated and appointed him for succession. When Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, departs from the living, you will seat the crown prince designate Ashurbanipal upon the royal throne, he will exercise the kingship and overlordship of Assyria over you.[183]

Following his statement of purpose, Esarhaddon includes several hundred lines of treaty curses for those who do not serve Ashurbanipal with the highest allegiance. Among these curses, we find the following,

---

183.James B. Pritchard, Daniel E. Fleming, and William Foxwell Albright, *The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures*, 1 ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 214.

> May Ninurta, leader of the gods, fell you with his fierce arrow, and fill the plain with your corpses, give your flesh to eagles and vultures to feed upon.[184]
>
> ...let dogs and pigs eat your flesh, and may your spirit have no one to take care of and our libations on him.[185]
>
> May [...] hand you over to a man-eating lion."[186]
>
> ...may dogs and pigs drag around in the squares of Ashur the . . . of your young women, the . . . of your young men before your eyes, may the earth not receive your body for burial, may the bellies of dogs and pigs by your burial place..."[187]
>
> May Palil, lord of first rank, let eagles and vultures eat your flesh."[188]

In this succession treaty, the current suzerain is securing the loyalty of his vassals for the future suzerain. The threat of non-burial and one's cor-

184. Ibid., 221.

185. Ibid.

186. Ibid.

187. Ibid., 222.

188. Ibid.

pse being food for the wild animals is unquestionably attached to both authority and covenant.

Esarhaddon includes a similar curse in his treaty with Baal of Tyre, a treaty in which Esarhaddon claims authority over waters and any ships wrecked therein off the coast of the Philistine and Assyrian territory. Those who violate the treaty find themselves under the following curse, among others. "May Bethel and Anath-Bethel deliver you to a man-eating lion."[189] While the Philistines and their territory are notoriously hard to identify, the connection in this treaty of the Philistines and Esarhaddon, who, it seems, was quite ready to enforce his treaties with threat of animal consumption, may well provide a contextual link to the Philistines in the valley of Gath whose champion breathes similar threats as Esarhaddon.

3.3.1.B - Yāda'

The limits of the current project disallow a full exploration of "knowing" and its potential technical uses throughout the Ancient Near East; however, one cannot merely overlook this vital theme as it proves significant

189.Ibid., 213.

in the fourth element of David's taunt, the only element which is not repeated from Goliath's taunt. The study by Huffmon,[190] referenced above regarding the Hebrew *yāda'* proves helpful, along with a second study by Huffmon and Parker.[191] In these two studies Huffmon and Parker identify technical uses of "know" in eight Ancient Near Eastern texts: 1) "the treaty between the Hittite king Suppiluliumas and Huqqanas from eastern Asia Minor;"[192] 2) "the treaty between Muwattallis and Alaksandus from western Asia Minor;"[193] 3) various "Hittite Instruction Texts;"[194] 4) a letter of from Abdi-Ašrita in the Armana tablets;[195] 5) "a treaty between Kurtiwaza (Mattiwaza) and Suppiluliumas;"[196] 6) "a letter to Esarhaddon;"[197] 7) "an Akkadian text from Mari;"[198] and 8) "a

190. Huffmon, "The Treaty Background".

191. Herbert B. Huffmon and Simon B. Parker, "A Further Note on the Treaty Background of Hebrew Yāda," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 184, (1966): 36-38.

192. Huffmon, "The Treaty Background", 31.

193. Ibid., 32.

194. Ibid.

195. Ibid.

196. Ibid., 33.

197. Ibid.

198. Huffmon and Parker, "A Further Note", 36.

Ugaritic text for Ras Shamra."[199] These uses lead the authors to conclude, "a technical usage of Hittite *šak*- and Akkadian *idû*, 'know,' in international treaties and related texts in the sense 'recognize (authority, claims)' provided the background for the understanding of the Hebrew *yāda'* in certain special contexts."[200] While much more could undoubtedly be developed from a close look at the use of "knowing" language in the Ancient Near East and a comparison to synonymous language in the Old Testament, this brief survey of the use of such language in Ancient Near Eastern texts further undergirds the importance of David's fourth taunt element.

3.3.2 - Narrative Parallels

Possible narrative parallels to the David and Goliath narrative are more frequent than the linguistic parallels. The wide range of literature on narrative parallels results more from the numerous ways one can approach literary questions than from a single agreed-upon literary pattern into which the David and Goliath narrative fits. In examining narrative parallels, the current work is not seeking to answer the more specific ques-

199.Ibid.

200.Ibid.

tion of intertextuality, an enormously complicated question addressing dependence as noted by Frolov and Wright.[201] Instead, we are seeking to examine how narrative parallels functioned in their literary settings. Narrative parallels have been proposed in reference to various aspects of the David and Goliath narrative. The current research will focus on single/representative combat in Ancient Near East sources.

3.3.2.A - Single/Representative Combat

In his work on single combat in the Old Testament, de Vaux's argument for various parallels sets the stage for much of the discussion to follow.[202] In response to his work, numerous scholars have pointed out that a distinction between single combat and representative combat is mandatory in assessing parallels. Whereas single combat can encompass any two figures in combat with no necessary implications on the outcome of any more massive battle, representative combat takes explicitly into account scenes wherein some representative subset of opposing armies fight under the auspices of a winner-takes-all agreement. A further distinction between representative combat and a contest of champions may

201. Frolov and Wright, "Homeric and Ancient Near Eastern Intertextuality".

202. de Vaux, *The Bible*.

also be helpful as one cannot assume every contest of champions is an example of representative combat. One finds two possible examples of single combat in Ancient Near Eastern sources.

3.3.2.A.i - Enuma Elish

In the *Enuma Elish*, Marduk straightforwardly challenges Tiamat saying, "Stand thou up, that I and thou meet in single combat" (*Enuma Elish*, IV.86)![203] Tiamat's response and the ensuing battle are then recorded.

> She was like one possessed; she took leave of her senses.
> In fury Tiamat cried out aloud.
> To the roots her legs shook both together.
> She recites a charm, keeps casting her spell,
> While the gods of battle sharpen their weapons.
> Then joined issue Tiamat and Marduk, wisest of gods.
> They strove in single combat, locked in battle (*Enuma Elish*, IV.88-94).[204]

---

203. James Bennett Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testamen*, 2nd ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), 67.

204. Ibid.

The background of the battle between Tiamat and Marduk is important in understanding what is at stake in the battle. Tiamat is on a quest, with great support from the gods, to avenge the murder of her husband by her children. Marduk has been selected as the hero who can stand against Tiamat. In return for his victory over Tiamat, which would save his people, he asks his father for supremacy.

> Creator of the gods, destiny of the great gods,
> If I indeed, as your avenger,
> Am to vanquish Tiamat and save your lives,
> Set up the Assembly, proclaim supreme my destiny!
> When jointly in Ubshukinna you have sat down rejoicing,
> Let my word, instead of you, determine the fates.
> Unalterable shall be what I may bring into being;
> Neither recalled nor changed shall be the command of my lips
> (*Enuma Elish*, II.122-129).[205]

The battle between Tiamat and Marduk was simultaneously to bring about the salvation of the people and establish the supremacy of Marduk. In addition, this is presented as a battle between gods, a holy war of sorts, complete with the invocation of curses. Even as Tiamat's troupe

205.Ibid., 64.

turned to flee, they found themselves surrounded and captured. This battle is most certainly an example of single combat, but in so far as the salvation of a people is at stake, there is some aspect of representative combat at work as well.

3.3.2.A.ii - The Story of Si-nuhe

The Egyptian *Story of Si-nuhe* exhibits multiple parallels with the David and Goliath narrative, as well as other biblical narratives. After telling of his successful administration of Amm-ienshi's estate, marrying Ammienshi's daughter, raising a family, and growing wealthy, Si-nuhe recounts his run-in with the hero of Retenu.

> A mighty man of Retenu came, that he might challenge me in my (own) camp. He was a hero without his peer, and he had repelled all of it. He said that he would fight me, he intended to despoil me, and he planned to plunder my cattle, on the advice of his tribe...
>
> When day broke, (Re)tenu was come. It had whipped up its tribes and collected the countries of a (good) half of it. It had thought only of this fight. Then he came to me as I was waiting, (for) I had placed myself near him. Every heart burned for me; women and men

groaned. Every heart was sick for me. They said: "Is there another strong man who could fight against him?" Then (he took) his shield, his battle-axe, and his armful of javelins. Now after I had let his weapons issue forth, I made his arrows pass by my uselessly, one close to another. He charged me, and I shot him, my arrow sticking in his neck. He cried out and fell on his nose. I felled him with his (own) battle-axe and raised my cry of victory over his back, while every Asiatic roared. I gave praise to Montu while his adherents were mourning for him. The ruler Ammi-enshi took me into his embrace. Then I carried off his goods and plundered his cattle. What he had planned to do to me I did to him. I took what was in his tent and stripped his encampment. I became great thereby, I became extensive in my wealth, I became abundant in my cattle.

Thus did god to show mercy to him upon whom he had laid blame, whom he had led astray to another country.[206]

Bearing in mind the previously established distinctions between single and representative combat, we must take the battle between Si-nuhe and the mighty man of Retenu as an example of single, and possibly representative combat. However, several other narrative parallels exist be-

206. Pritchard, Fleming, and Albright, *The Ancient Near East*, 8.

tween the account of Si-nuhe's battle and the David and Goliath narrative. Frolov and Wright point out six parallels:

1. The protagonist picks up the gauntlet on behalf of his suzerain (Saul in 1 Samuel 17; Amni-enshi in the Story), who is present on the battlefield, and with his explicit blessing (1 Sm 17:37b).
2. The antagonist is felled with a single projectile (an arrow in the Story; a stone form a slingshot in 1 Sm 17:49).
3. The antagonist collapses face down ("on his nose" in the Story; "face to the ground" in 1 Samuel 17:49).
4. The antagonist is finished off with his own weapon (an axe in the Story; a sword in 1 Sm 17:51).
5. The protagonist's side boisterously cheers his victory ("Asiatics roar" in the Story; Israelites "shout" in 1 Sm 17:52).
6. The camp of the losing side is plundered; this is presented in "measure for measure" terms, as the "mighty man of Retenu" allegedly had been after Sinuhe's cattle, and Goliath wanted Israel to serve the Philistines (1 Sm 17:9).[207]

To these six parallels, one could add four more:

207. Frolov and Wright, “Homeric and Ancient Near Eastern Intertextuality”, 466.

1. Like Goliath, the "mighty man of Retenu... was a hero without his peer."
2. As with David, there was some doubt as to Si-nuhe's ability to defeat the mighty man.
3. As in 1 Samuel 17, there is focus on the extensive weaponry of the mighty man (a battle-axe, an armful of javelins, and arrows are all mentioned), over against the relatively humble weaponry of Si-nuhe (only arrows and a dagger are mentioned).
4. Before his fight, David turned Goliath's intentions back on him, and, similarly, Si-nuhe declares, "What he had planned to do to me I did to him."

3.3.3 - Conclusions to Parallels Between David and Goliath Narrative and Ancient Near Eastern Literature

Numerous parallels, both linguistic and narrative, can be found between the David and Goliath narrative and Ancient Near Eastern literature.

Linguistic parallels were found in both reports and threats or non-burial throughout the Ancient Near East. Elements that are common to these sources include the involvement deities, the maintenance and enforce-

ment of covenantally defined relationships, the assertion of authority, eschatological implications, and "knowing." These common and repeated elements point to the purposeful use of language in such parallels and therefor in the David and Goliath narrative as well. While such elements are not identical with our working understanding of Old Testament Messianism, they are not unrelated. One could find parallels to divine agency in the invocation of various deities as well as elements redemption, judgement and dominion in the enforcement of covenantally defined relationships and the technical use of "knowing" in the Ancient Near East.

In addition to the linguistic parallels, potential narrative parallels were examined. While there is some caution required in both the defining and appropriation of the narrative parallels, when one examines where single/representative combat appear in Ancient Near Eastern, possible parallels are found. It should be noted that such parallels are not as clearly or directly related to the David and Goliath narrative as are the linguistic parallels.

While the simple identification of such parallels is only marginally helpful in the present discussion, the examination of particular elements and functions required to identify potential parallels begins to reveal a characteristic pattern of rhetorical function among the parallels. If such a

standard rhetorical function is present, the existence of Ancient Near Eastern literary parallels to the David and Goliath narrative may indeed prove helpful in understanding how our narrative functions in its literary context. It is to the rhetorical function of these parallels that we now turn.

3.4 - How are these parallels functioning in their respective contexts?

Having established that one finds literary parallels with the David and Goliath narrative throughout Ancient Near Eastern literature, raises the question of the rhetorical function of the literary parallels. If there is a consistent purpose for which the linguistic and narrative parallels to 1 Samuel 17 are used, one would have to consider the possibility of 1 Samuel sharing not only the linguistic and narrative characteristics but also rhetorical. A shared rhetorical function would certainly shed some light on the meaning of the David and Goliath narrative, its function in the broader context of both the History of David's Rise and 1 Samuel as a whole and by extension help inform the reader regarding the 1 Samuel.

3.4.1 - Rhetorical Function of Linguistic Parallels

Considering the above reports of non-burial and carrion-eating animals that were found to contain linguistic parallels to 1 Samuel 17, one observes several points that help inform the reader of the rhetorical function of both the reports and threats of non-burial. These points help one understanding the function of the David and Goliath narrative in its original context.

3.4.1.A - Reports of Non-Burial

First, each of the above examples involves deities, some type of covenantal relationship, or both. While one cannot conclude that all covenantal arrangements involved carrion animals, it seems that the inverse may be true. The votive inscriptions such as the Stele of the Vultures would have been erected, perhaps at a border, to commemorate the victory represented and serve as a warning to those who would violate the border agreement in the future. While there is evidence that such monuments were of little effect[208], the intention was clear, "Assyrian kings used representations of conquest to validate the territorial expan-

208.Gábor Sulyok, “Breach of Treaties in the Ancient Near East,” *Journal of the History of International Law* 20, no. 1 (2018), 33.

sion of the empire."[209] Additionally, these monuments served as a reminder, to future detractors, of the king's power and willingness to subject their enemies to non-burial and being consumed by wild animals, a genuine threat given the beliefs about the importance of burial for the afterlife that seems to be prevalent throughout the Ancient Near East.

Second, even though the above examples are reports of non-burial and corpse abuse, most are functioning either as the execution of a covenant or as a threat for would-be covenant violators. A study of Ancient Near Eastern marriage practices reveals the strong contractual or covenantal nature of this institution in Ancient Near Eastern contexts.[210]

Third, while there are many accounts of non-burial in various forms, the use of carrion-eating animals is somewhat rare and found in specific types of situations. When one finds the report of non-burial and corpse

---

209. Irene J Winter, "After the Battle is Over: The "stele of the Vultures" and the Beginning of Historical Narrative in the Art of the Ancient Near East," *Studies in the History of Art* Symposium Papers IV: Pictorial Narrative in Antiquity and the Middle Ages, no. 16 (1985), 12.

210. See Samuel Greengus, "The Old Babylonian Marriage Contract," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1969): 505-532. and Marten Stol, *Women in the Ancient Near East*, trans. Helen and Mervyn Richardson (Boston: Walter de Gruyter Inc., 2016).

abuse by carrion animals, there is a common rhetorical point of both the authority, often defined in terms of a covenant, and the ability and willingness to carry out such consequential acts on those who would challenge the authority. Commenting on the fate of being fed to wild animals in "The Death of Sennacherib", Abusch succinctly states, "Such is the fate of those who have committed crimes against the empire."[211]

With a clear picture of how reports of non-burial and carrion-eating animals functioned in Ancient Near Eastern texts, one can now turn to an examination of threats of non-burial and carrion-eating animals, which are closer parallels to the David and Goliath narrative.

3.4.1.B - Threats of Non-Burial

Threats of carrion-eating animals used as an anticipatory curse in the Ancient Near East and beyond share a multi-faceted rhetorical function with far-reaching implications. First, as has been pointed out in the many helpful anthropological works on death and burial in the Ancient Near East, threats of non-burial carry eschatological implications. One's corpse being devoured by animals was a clear signal to the eschatological

211. Abusch, *Mesopotamian Witchcraft*, 231.

non-existence of the person devoured. Their existence would not continue in the afterlife. Second, anticipatory, carrion threats were not exclusively eschatological, but also carried present-life implications. As seen in both the Maqlu tablets and the Esarhaddon treaties, such potent curses were invoked when present authority structures were anticipating or confronting a challenger, whether spiritual, as in Maqlu, or political, as in the Esarhaddon treaties concerning both Ashurbanipal and Baal of Tyre. Just as the reporting of such treatment of corpses was designed to strike fear in any potential covenant violators, so too is the threat of one's corpse being devoured used in an attempt to direct human behavior to condemn and avenge a prior action. Third, threats of being devoured by animals are frequently found as curses for violation of covenants and treaties. Fourth, in every instance surveyed, carrion curses involve the invocation of deities either as witnesses to the threat and/or the treaty being established or as the one who will accomplish the threat.

3.4.1.C - Conclusions to the Rhetorical Function of Linguistic Parallels

From our analysis of the Ancient Near Eastern linguistic parallels compared to the taunting language in 1 Samuel 17, one can draw the follow-

ing conclusions regarding the use of non-burial and carrion-eating animals in the Ancient Near East.

1. In reports and especially in threats of non-burial deities are invoked.

2. In both reports and threats of non-burial and carrion-eating animals, the establishment, maintenance, or enforcement of covenantal relationship are usually in view.

3. There is a common rhetorical point of both the authority and the ability and willingness to carry out such consequential acts on those who would challenge the standing authority.

4. Non-burial in the Ancient Near East carried both present life and eschatological implications.

5. "Knowing" an authority is a common element in international treaties.

In light of the broader questions being asked regarding the function of the taunting language in the David and Goliath narrative and how a right understanding of the use of such language may help the reader uncover the meaning of the 1 Samuel 17, the History of David's Rise, and the book of Samuel as a whole, the function of the Ancient Near Eastern lin-

guistic parallels lends support to the idea that the use of such language is both purposeful and pregnant with meaning and therefore cannot be passed over without due consideration to its function. Further, the similar function of taunting language in the David and Goliath narrative and Ancient Near Eastern texts begs the question of whether there might be deeper narrative parallels that shed light on the way forward with understanding 1 Samuel 17. It is to these parallels that the present research now turns.

3.4.2 - Rhetorical Function of Narrative Parallels

As with the linguistic parallels, one observes various points regarding the rhetorical function of narrative parallels to the David and Goliath Narrative, and these points also prove helpful in the interpretation of the narrative.

3.4.2.A - Single/Representative Combat

The import of single/representative combat could be the preservation of life with its various advantages, which were undoubtedly many. However, the few examples of single/representative combat found in the An-

cient Near East and beyond, over against the numerous records of battles fought with full armies, raises questions as to the purpose of single/representative combat beyond the practical. If the preservation of life were the only motivating factor, one would expect to find many more examples of representative combat, for every battle would have significantly lower casualty rates if single/representative combat were used. Further, the annals of the Ancient Near East do not show a great concern for the preservation of life in battle, but frequently celebrate the utter destruction of people. Consider the following report from Shalmaneser III,

> I slew 14,000 of their soldiers with the sword, descending upon them like Adad when he makes a rainstorm pour down. I spread their corpses (everywhere), filling the entire plain with their widely scattered (fleeing) soldiers. During the battle I made their blood flow down the *hur-pa-lu* of the district The plain was too small to let (all) their (text: his) souls descend (into the nether world), the vast field gave out (when it came) to bury them. With their (text: sing.) corpses I spanned the Orontes before there was a bridge.[212]

Each of the few examples of single/representative combat in the Ancient Near East have something beyond merely expanding an empire in view.

---

212. Pritchard, Fleming, and Albright, *The Ancient Near East*, 256-257.

The story of Tiamat and Marduk is a story of divine vengeance for the killing of Tiamat's husband. The wrongdoing of those represented by Marduk is coming back in the form of Tiamat's judgement. In addition to saving those he represents from such divine judgement, Marduk will be exalted as supreme.

In the case of the story of Sinuhe, something more than simple expansion is in view, for Sinuhe, who has successfully commanded armies of Retenu is being attacked by an insider, a mighty man of Retenu, leaving Sinuhe to conclude before his prince, "...it is hostility because he sees me carrying out thy commissions."[213] Authority, or at least stature, within the kingdom seems to be in view rather than military expansion of a kingdom.

The single/representative combat scenes from *The Iliad* also are not stories of expansion but are the playing out of divine discord in human players. *The Iliad* tells part of Achilles's non-role and eventual role in the Trojan War, of which both depend on Achilles' vengeance derived from different circumstances. The entire Trojan War has divine discord as its backdrop and is riddled with numerous deals struck between gods and men for aid at various junctures. *The Iliad's* battles are not battles of em-

213.Ibid., 7.

pire expansion as much as they are battles of personal vendetta and vengeance.

That there are more significant, or at least other, purposes beyond the saving of lives in the examples or single/representative combat found throughout both the Ancient Near East and ancient Greece gives one reason to find a more significant purpose in the representative combat found within the David and Goliath narrative as well.

3.4.2.B - Taunting Language

While there were no direct parallels to the taunting language found in the pre-battle exchange between David and Goliath, the function of taunting language, where it is found throughout the Ancient Near East, seems informative of the language in 1 Samuel 17. Taunting language is used to various ends throughout the Ancient Near East. Most commonly, such language is used to incite fear in the hearer, belittle the hearer, and exalt the speaker, that is to engage in a type of "psychological warfare." Additionally, as noted above, taunting language could play a role in both covenant formation. In the David and Goliath narrative, there is also a clear theological purpose as David announces the supremacy of Yahweh.

3.4.3 - Conclusions to Rhetorical Function of Ancient Near Eastern Parallels to David and Goliath

There is a remarkable overlap between the rhetorical functions of each of the linguistic and narrative parallels surveyed above. In their respective contexts, fear, authority, and vengeance come into play with some regularity. Whether as part of a report published as a king's annal, the text of a formal treaty or boundary marker, or a personal announcement, the image of wild animals feasting on one's corpse was designed to ground the future conflict or some previous outcome in the worst possible eschatological terms. Here then we see a parallel to the judgment function of Old Testament Messianism. When used as an anticipatory curse in treaties, this particularly pointed form of non-burial seems to have been reserved for those treaties designed to secure authority, either pertaining to the spiritual realm, as in *Maqlu*, or pertaining to the political realm as in the Esarhaddon treaties. In this, one finds a comparison to the aspect of dominion at work in Old Testament Messianism. When anticipatory threats were used in other scenarios, they involved personal vengeance.

Additionally, the invocation and involvement of the divine frequently provided an extra layer of drama as the god on whom the treaty calls is

often the one named to carry out the threat. The agency of Yahweh connected with Old Testament Messianism is reflected here in the god on whom the treaty calls being the one who acts. Similarly, the taunting speech had the rhetorical function of striking fear into the one taunted as well as seeking to exalt the one doing the taunting as the more powerful participant. For this reason, one often gave a verisimilar response in order to save face.

The act of single/representative combat may have had a more practical function in the moment; although, examples such as the scene in the *Story of Sinuhe*, surely had in view more than the preservation of life. In this story, a battle for authority or control is almost certainly in view. Further, the recounting of the feats of mighty men and their victories in representative combat situations would undoubtedly serve as a warning against any would-be challengers. Their reputation would precede them as it did with the mighty man of Retenu and Achilles.

While there is no non-biblical, Ancient Near Eastern example in which every parallel examined coalesces, it seems beyond reasonable to assume such a text, were it found, would have the rhetorical effect of a purposeful, caricatured presentation of what each parallel held in common, namely, treaty/covenant relationships and authority. Indeed, when

read against its Ancient Near Eastern background, with the employment of anticipatory carrion curses, representative combat, taunting speech, and "knowing" language, nothing less than a type of literary hyperbole seems to be at work in the David and Goliath narrative, steering the reader toward an interpretation of the text that reaches beyond a mere reporting of history to an announcement of a future hope for Israel and judgment on her enemies. A hope that is founded on David's use of the Deuteronomic curse language to announce Yahweh's promised judgement on the enemies of Israel and the redemption of Israel through the agency of Yahweh.

3.5 - Chapter Conclusions

One can find numerous parallels for the biblical non-burial language can be found throughout the Ancient Near East. Such language is often found in report scenes involving deities, covenant administration and enforcement, and challenge to authority. The specific non-burial curse of animals devouring one's corpse is both somewhat rarer and somewhat more specific. Reports of carrion-eating animals are found almost exclusively in covenantal contexts highlighting the suzerain's authority and ability to carry out consequential judgement. Similarly, threats of non-

burial and carrion-eating animals are found in Ancient Near Eastern sources as well. Common to these threats were eschatological implications, the one threatened with such action would cease to exist altogether.

Further, as with the reports of non-burial language, threats were often found in covenantal structures and with the invocation of a deity. In addition to the linguistic parallels, the narrative parallels were also identified. Examples of single and representative combat, which came together in the battle of David and Goliath, were both found in various ancient texts frequently featuring themes of divine judgement and authority. Each of these features, which were not found altogether in an Ancient Near Eastern text other than 1 Samual 17 nonetheless contribute to the rhetorical function of the text in which one finds them. The piling up of so much Ancient Near Eastern rhetoric in the David and Goliath narrative seems to point to a very purposeful story being told in 1 Samuel 17. While one would not expect to find Old Testament Messianism in the Ancient Near East outside of a Yahwehistic context for obvious reasons, it is significant that the rhetorical function of the Ancient Near Eastern literary parallels that have been examined deal with ideas consistent with many of the ideas of Old Testament Messianism- divine agency, redemption of the favored people, judgment on foes, and dominion particularly.

In this light, if one desired to tell a story consistent with Old Testament Messianism and there existed established literary forms that communicated ideas consistent with the intended message, it would be advantageous to employ those forms to one's literary ends. With this in mind, we will return once again to the text of 1 Samuel to explore how a reading of the David and Goliath narrative as a purposeful story designed not merely to communicate historical facts but to make rather specific types of covenantal and eschatological statements related to the presentation of David as the Messianic King might inform our reading of the History of David's Rise and the book of Samuel as a whole.

4 - Chapter 4: David as Messianic King

To this point, the current research has examined the taunting language found in the David and Goliath narrative in light of its internal structure, Old Testament parallels, and Ancient Near Eastern literary parallels. It has been shown that while there is not a definite, concrete paradigm for announcing judgement through threats of non-burial and corpse abuse by carrion-eating animals, there is a more general paradigm for the use of this language. That is to say, in both the Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern literature, when the language of non-burial and corpse abuse by carrion-eating animals is found, it is typically used to purposefully communicate particular ideas about the covenantal relationship of the vassal to the suzerain. The ideas communicated through such language touch on the authority and ability of the suzerain to establish, maintain, and enforce a covenantal relationship.

Further, the invocation of a deity or deities introduces important and persuasive eschatological themes highlighting the reality that the effects of non-burial and corpse abuse by carrion-eating animals are to be feared not only because of present implications but also because of the potential eschatological implications.

Additionally, while simple reports of such actions may have such effects on the reader of the reports, anticipatory curses and threats of non-burial and corpse abuse by carrion-eating animals are so designed in every instance examined. Further, we have shown that there is at least some overlap between the ideas associated with Old Testament Messianism as summarized by Motyer and the ideas associated with the use of threats of non-burial when found in both the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East. In light of these findings, there is good reason to read the David and Goliath narrative as one that builds to a decisive representative combat scene by way of ongoing threats which, when finally recorded, are indeed found to be threats of corpse abuse by carrion-eating animals in which deities are invoked, new suzerain-vassal relationships are proposed (at least from one side), and judgement is announced.

Reading 1 Samuel 17 in the way proposed begs several questions regarding its relationship to its immediate context. Is the David and Goliath narrative a stand-alone piece designed to show, literarily, how Israel employed political mechanisms common to the Ancient Near East? Is the David and Goliath narrative part of a more extensive, purposeful telling of Israel's history designed to communicate particular ideas about her re-

lationship to either David or Yahweh or both? If the latter, what precisely is being communicated?

In seeking an answer to the questions asked above regarding 1 Samuel 17's relation to its surrounding context, there are, of course, a great many ways forward. To be sure, in addition to the previously mentioned text and source-critical issues that are quite prevalent in 1 Samuel and in addition to the plethora of questions regarding the genre of both 1 Samuel as a whole and its proposed parts (e.g. the Ark narrative, the Saul Cycle, the History of David's Rise, and the Succession Narrative) a final answer to the questions of 1 Samuel 17's contribution to our understanding of the function of the text of Samuel as a whole would require tracing out and examining numerous possible themes and literary structures. There is not space within the confines of the current work to accomplish all that is needed. Therefore, the current research will proceed via an examination of how the function of two themes, messiah and king, working together, might concur with the function of the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative. We did not select these themes arbitrarily, but for the following three reasons. First, messiah and king are ideas that have been frequently discussed in relation to both David and the book of 1 Samuel. Second, within such discussions, covenant, suzerain-vassal relationship, and eschatology, ideas conveyed through threats of non-bur-

ial and corpse abuse by carrion-eating animals, quickly come into play making an exploration of these themes of immediate relevance to the current discussion in so far as these ideas overlap with the categories of Old Testament Messianism proposed earlier: Yahweh's choice of the messiah, redemption of Israel through the messiah, judgement of foes by the messiah, the messiah's dominion over the nations, and Yahweh's agency through the messiah.[214] Third, these themes have already been introduced of necessity in the current research through interaction with Rofé,[215] Kneirim,[216] Bright,[217] Kelly,[218] and Brueggeman.[219]

4.1 - Literature Review

Considering the topics of David, messiah, and king (not to mention the compound ideas of "Messianic King" or "David as a/the Messianic King") introduces questions on multiple fronts at once. In addition to the

---

214. Motyer, “Messiah,”, 764.

215. Rofé, “The Battle,”, Rofé, “David Overcomes Goliath (1 Samuel 17)”.

216. Knierim, “The Messianic Concept,”

217. John Bright, “I and Ii Samuel,” *Interpretation* 5, no. 4 (1951): 450-461.

218. Brian E. Kelly, “Samuel, Books of,” in *Dicitonary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible,* ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005).

219. Brueggemann, *Samuel*.

many questions regarding the historical David and the function of the Samuel narrative at the various proposed stages of its existence, one must consider critical questions of both messianism and kingship. At what stage in Israel's history does one begin to find any discernible messianic expectation? What is the nature of the earliest messianic expectation? How did messianic expectation develop throughout Israel's history? Did the development of messianic expectation arise from an evolving understanding of sacred texts, or did such development stem from longing for restoration in light of certain historical realities with which Israel was faced? How has the ubiquity of Christian messianism with its various developments since the time of Christ shaded even Jewish readings of Hebrew Scriptures in terms of messianic expectation? How was kingship understood in ancient Israel? By which of her Ancient Near Eastern neighbors was the Jewish concept of kingship most influenced? To what degree and in what ways did the exile impact Israel's view of and desire for kingship? When one considers such questions in relation to each other new questions are raised in regards to eschatological, apocalyptical expectation. Indeed, on the topic of a Davidic Messianic King, one can easily fall into an inescapable, interrogative echo-chamber.

Due to the broad range of topics and literature that exists on the current topic and the limitations of space, the literature included in this review is only the most pertinent to the specific questions that will be asked.

4.1.1 - Kingship in Israel

In addition to previously mentioned literature on David, when considering the current questions, one could add James Flanagan's[220] appropriation of the works of Service[221] and Renfrew[222] in which he argues based on the cultural evolutionary hypothesis that Saul and David both functioned as chiefs rather than kings. Flanagan is seeking to account for the apparent development of kingship within Israel, a development that exists at basic terminological levels, the institution of an individual as king, and the function of the king in society. Flanagan does not take a definite position regarding the number of discernible divisions between the ear-

220.James W Flanagan, "Chiefs in Israel," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 6, no. 20 (1981): 47-73.

221.Elman R. Service, *Primitive Social Organization: An Evolutionary Perspective*, Studies in Anthropolgy, vol. 3 (New York: Random House, 1971).

222.Colin Renfrew, "Beyond a Subsistence Economy: The Evolution of Social Organization in Prehistoric Europe," in *Reconstructing Complex Societies,* ed. Charlotte B. Moore, (Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1974).

ly-stage egalitarian tribal societies and a fully developed state, as defining such steps is not his goal; however, he does recognize the general tripartite division between tribe, chiefdom, and monarchy. Flanagan concludes, "David stood on the boundary line between chiefdom and kingdom."[223]

A key aspect of the sociological considerations, which Flanagan briefly addresses, are lexical examinations on the uses of נָגִיד and מֶלֶךְ as they are found both in Hebrew scriptures and as cognate words used throughout the Ancient Near East. Numerous scholars have surveyed the pertinent material, and Flanagan interacts with several showing how the thought has developed. Among these scholars, there is no consensus regarding either the development of the use of the terms or the implications thereof. Flanagan is probably correct and definitely wise in taking a more guarded route in the import of these terms for the discussion. The various sociological considerations are a helpful reminder that Israel not only did not exist in a vacuum but also did not appear in history as a fully developed society. While the sociological evolution of Israel can be overstated to the point of eliminating all divine influence, it can also be understated, opening the door for various interpretive anachronisms.

223.Flanagan, “Chiefs”, 67.

4.1.2 - Messiah

The research into the development of messianism in Israel is both substantial in amount and diverse in conclusion. While he was not the first to enter the discussion, Mowinckel's[224] *He That Cometh* is the jumping-off point for much of the discussion surrounding messianism at various stages in Israel's history. Mowinckel begins his discussion of messianism writing,

> In later Judaism the term 'Messiah' denotes an eschatological figure. He belongs to 'the last time'; his advent lies in the future. To use the word 'Messiah' is to imply eschatology, the last things. It is, therefore, a misuse of the words 'Messiah' and 'Messianic' to apply them, for instance, to those ideas which were associated in Israel or in the ancient east with kings who were actually reigning, even if, as we shall see, these ideas were expressed in exalted and mythical terms. The word 'Messiah' by itself, as a title and a name, originated in later Judaism as the designation of an eschatological figure; and it is therefore only to such a figure that it may be applied.[225]

---

224. Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2005).

225. Ibid., 3.

In his work, Mowinckel distinguishes between a more general "future hope" and eschatology more specifically. He understands "future hope" as developing throughout Israel's history. In the most simple terms, the future hope began as "a hope for something which had not yet come"[226] and following the exile developed into "a hope of restoration."[227] Mowinckel recognizes the obvious relationship between future hope and eschatology, stating, "Out of the future hope eschatology developed,"[228] yet distinguishes between the future hope and eschatology by attaching explicitly apocalyptic ideas to eschatology. He writes,

> Eschatology is a doctrine or a complex of ideas about the 'last things', which is more or less organically coherent and developed. Every eschatology includes in some form or other a dualistic conception of the course of history, and implies that the present state of things and the present world order will suddenly come to an end and be superseded by another of an essentially different kind.[229]

John Collins, who seems to be the unofficial, authoritative assimilator of Mowinckel both champions and critiques Mowinckel's earlier work.

226.Ibid., 133.

227.Ibid.

228.Ibid.

229.Ibid., 125.

Collins's main critique stems from the historical moment in which Mowinckel worked[230], his narrow defining of eschatology[231], and the apparent influence of Mowinckel's Christian faith on his interpretation.[232] In his comprehensive review of *He that Cometh*, Collins writes, "It is nonetheless true that this book, like all books, is a product of a particular time and place. It is also true that all historical study is altered by ongoing discoveries."[233] On the one hand, Mowinckel's moment required his interaction with the Myth and Ritual school and the ensuing debates and discussions regarding the influence of Ancient Near Eastern culture on Israel.[234]

On the other hand, working only a decade after the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and seeking to answer questions on which the Dead Sea Scrolls would have a significant impact,[235] Mowinckel's work was predisposed to needing updating. Collins also points out the detriment of Mowinckel's narrow understanding of eschatology, noting that the apoc-

---

230.John J. Collins, “Mowinckel’s *He That Cometh* Revisited,” *Studia Theologica* 61, no. 1 (2007), 3.

231.Ibid., 5.

232.Ibid., 11.

233.Ibid., 3.

234.Ibid., 4-5.

235.Ibid., 12.

alyptic eschatology of Mowinckel is one aspect of a "broader phenomenon"[236] that includes "Hopes for the restoration of Israel"[237] designated by Mowinckel as "future hope" in contradistinction to eschatology.[238] Despite the necessary limits of Mowinckel's moment, the care and thoroughness of his work led to a contribution that has stood the test of time.

Since Mowinckel, volumes by Van Groningen,[239] Charlesworth,[240] Collins,[241] Day,[242] and several others have contributed significantly to the

---

236. Ibid., 5.

237. Ibid.

238. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 133.

239. Gerard Van Groningen, *Messianic Revelation in the Old Testament*, vol. 1 (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1997).

240. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

241. John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, The Anchor Bible Reference Library (New York: Doubleday, 1995). see also Collins, “He That Cometh Revisited”. and Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2008).

242. *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day, Library of Hebrew Bible/old Testament Studies (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

discussion of messianism. Van Groningen is of particular interest to the present work in processing the relationship between the narrow and wider formulations of messiah in the Old Testament. He defines the narrow concept of messiah as, "the idea of the king as the anointed one,"[243] and the wider concept as, "any additional aspects involved in the concept of *māšîah*."[244] Van Gronigen's contribution departs from Mowinckel and others who see the king as messiah, but not necessarily in any sense beyond merely being the king. He presents an argument that the broader concept, which includes promises of redemption and all that is entailed therein, is not exclusively a later development but is at play throughout the Old Testament in such a way that an Old Testament Messianism can be developed.

In considering Van Groningen's distinction between narrower and wider conceptions of Old Testament Messianism, it is essential to recognize that the surrounding debate cannot be restricted to a debate between more critical and more conservative scholarship. In his essay, "My Servant David: Ancient Israel's Vision of the Messiah," Daniel Block seeks "to explore the Old Testament portrayal of the messiah, with the hope of coming to a realistic understanding of how the ancient Israelites viewed

243. Van Groningen, *Messianic Revelation*, 20.

244. Ibid.

this intriguing figure."[245] In other words, Block seeks to look behind the theological development of the messiah concept that has undoubtedly taken place to understand its original meaning. In answer to his question, Block concludes,

> If the New Testament portrayal of the life and ministry of Jesus contains Mosaic or prophetic or Aaronic features (which it does), these features should be interpreted as retrospective and analogical adaptations of Old Testament motifs rather than as fulfillments of Old Testament expectations. But these analogical links are not accidental... However, this is different from saying that the Old Testament believers saw in Moses and Aaron or the prophets foreshadowings of the future (in terms of time-space realities) messiah.[246]

Block does not go as far as Mowinckel in seeing messiah as being misapplied as a technical term before the eschatological attachments that came via later Jewish thought and development. Nonetheless, his position stops somewhat short of this responders in the same volume who

---

245. Daniel I. Block, "My Servant David: Ancient Israel's Vision of the Messiah," in *Israel's Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. Richard S. Hess and M. Daniel Carroll, (Eugenie, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 22.

246. Ibid., 56.

agree with Block as far as he goes in seeing a royal Davidic messianic figure, but, employing a different hermeneutical methodology with more emphasis on theological interpretation, argue that one is right to find a more robust Old Testament Messianism at work.[247]

Charlesworth and Collins focus primarily on the development of the messianic understanding in the final centuries BCE as found in the extra-biblical writings including the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the volume edited by Day, J.G. McConville has a helpful essay examining the concepts of both king and Messiah. After a thorough examination of Deuteronomic kingship, McConville asserts that while "there is no easy path from our texts to a messianic theology... the parameters of a messianic theology are clear."[248] The parameters McConville offers are the "law of the king

---

247.J. Daniel Hays, “If He Looks Like a Prophet and Talks Like a Prophet, Then He Must be…: A Response to Daniel I. Block,” in *Israel’s Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. Richard S. Hess and M. Daniel Carroll, (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003). and M. Daniel Carroll R., “New Lenses to Establish Messiah’s Identity?: A Response to Daniel I. Block,” in *Israel’s Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. Richard S. Hess and M. Daniel Carroll, (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003).

248.J.G. McConville, “King and Messiah in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History,” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar,* ed. John Day, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), 293.

in Deut. 17.14-20"[249] and "the dynastic promise to David"[250] of which he says there is a "permanent, or eternal, character, from which the Old Testament messianism chiefly draws its force."[251] McConville, then, rightly recognizes that while the presence of a developed, early messianism in Israel can be exaggerated, nonetheless, in the Deuteronomistic History one, at least, finds the foundation for such development and "The modern trend towards reading the books of DtrH as separate works, each with their own tendency and theology, supports a reading of DtrH that allows the messianic theology of Samuel to survive..."[252] In addition to McConville, essays from Day's volume by Barton[253], Reimer[254], Hor-

249.Ibid.

250.Ibid.

251.Ibid., 294.

252.Ibid., 294-295.

253.John Barton, “The Messiah in Old Testament Theology,” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar,* ed. John Day, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

254.Daivd J. Reimer, “Old Testament Christology,” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar,* ed. John Day, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

bury[255], Brooke[256], and Alexander[257] offer helpful insights into hermeneutical questions that inevitably arise with the study of messianism in the Old Testament and the development of the concepts of kingship and messiah in ancient, extra-biblical, Jewish writings.

In a separate essay, McConville addresses the hermeneutical issues that arise with the question of Old Testament Messianism. He writes,

> An understanding of the Old Testament's contribution to the theme involves a genuine two-way process (between Old and New). The validity of a Christian understanding of the Old Testament must

255. William Horbury, "Messianism in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudipigrapha," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar,* ed. John Day, Library of hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

256. George J. Brooke, "Kingship and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar,* ed. John Day, Library of hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies (2013).

257. Philip S. Alexander, "The King Messiah in Rabbinic Judaism," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar,* ed. John Day, Library of hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

> depend in the last analysis on the cogency of the argument that the Old Testament *is* messianic.[258]

It is to this two-way process that the current work hopes to contribute by examining if, in fact, one can say of the David and Goliath narrative, when read against its Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern backgrounds, *is* messianic. To this end, Philip Satterthwaite contributes an article to the same volume regarding David's functioning in the book of Samuel as a messianic figure in which he argues,

> The three poetic texts, Hannah's Song, David's Thanksgiving, and David's Last Words, seem, as Childs has noted, to have been placed at either end of 1 and 2 Samuel as a hermeneutical bracket, presenting an interpretation of the main narratives and, in particular, of the figure who features so prominently in them, King David, the anointed of YHWH.[259]

258.J.G. McConville, "Messianic Interpretation of the Old Testament in Modern Context," in *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts,* ed. Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham, (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1995), 17.

259.Philip E. Satterthwaite, "David in Th Books of Samuel: A Messianic Hope?," in *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts,* ed. Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham, (Eugnene: Wipf & Stock,

Satterthwaite goes on to develop a full-orbed view of David concerning messianic expectation that accounts for both his triumphs and failures reminding us that when we claim the Old Testament or a figure therein is messianic, we are not necessarily claiming they are not also flawed.

4.1.3 - Messianic King

In his essay, "Canaanite Inheritance of the Israelite Monarchy,"[260] John Day argues for Canaanite influences on the Israelite monarchy over against Hittite and Egyptian influences. Of specific interest to the current research is his exploration of the Israelite king's relationship to Melchizedek and the practice of anointing kings in Hittite, Egyptians, and possibly Canaanite settings. While he notes, "the term *māšîah* 'Anointed' (whence the word 'Messiah') is applied in the Old Testament to the current Israelite king, not the future eschatological one,'[261] other connections between the Israelite and Canaanite king traditions may give reason to

---

1995), 43.

260.John Day, “The Canaanite Inheritance of the Israelite Monarchy,” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar,* ed. John Day, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

261.Ibid., 80.

find future, eschatological messianic undertones in Israelite kingship. In this regard, the connection between the Israelite king and Melchizedek may prove insightful. Day concludes, "Although much of the evidence is circumstantial the conclusion of this essay is that Canaanite influence was a significant factor in the origins of Israel's monarchy."[262] He goes on to tie Canaanite influence specifically to the Davidic kingship stating, "In addition to Ps. 110.4, a general argument in favour of specifically Jebusite influence on David's kingship is the contrast with his predecessor Saul. Saul's kingship was much simpler and rustic, like that of a permanent judge whereas David had the full trappings of a court and harem and so on."[263]

On the other side of the discussion regarding the Ancient Near Eastern influences on kingship in Israel is J.J.M. Roberts.[264] Roberts follows Von Rad's conjecture "that the Judean enthronement ritual was heavily dependent on the corresponding Egyptian ritual."[265] Similarly, Collins, without denying a Mesopotamian influence on Israelite kingship, argues,

---

262.Ibid., 90.

263.Ibid.

264.J.J.M. Roberts, “Whose Child is This? Reflections on the Speaking Voice in Isaiah 9: 5,” *Harvard Theological Review* 90, no. 2 (1997): 115-129.

265.Ibid., 115.

"there is reason to believe that the Judahite understanding of kingship was at least indirectly influenced by Egyptian mythological traditions."[266]

Bringing questions of kingship and messianism together, T.N.D. Mettinger[267] has provided a useful analysis of various germane questions, in particular questions surrounding the textual evidence of the practice of anointing kings in ancient Israel. Mettinger sees a development of the royal anointing idea from the secular to the sacral.[268] "As a result of the conception of the divine anointing of the king the term *mašî^{a}h* became a key term to denote the king in his relation to God."[269]

Of particular interest to the current project is Rolf Knierim's article, "The Messianic Concept in the First Book of Samuel,"[270] in which Knierim, building on the critical scholarship that sought to identify the various textual stages and sources of 1 Samuel engages in a helpful, literary/the-

---

266. Collins, “He That Cometh Revisited”, 6.

267. Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*, ed. Gillis Gerleman and Helmer Ringgren, Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series, vol. 8 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1976).

268. Ibid., 230.

269. Ibid., 231.

270. Knierim, “The Messianic Concept,”

ological reading of 1 Samuel. Knierim takes the general scholarly agreement as to the literary units of the Samuel narrative stating, "Almost all scholars have come to the conclusion that these original literary works not only have become bound together in the course of generations but have been expanded by additions from written and oral traditions and, above all, have been reinterpreted."[271] From this starting point, Knierim begins his interpretive work with the idea that whatever an earlier literary stratum might have meant, that early stratum has now purposefully been woven together with various later literary strata in order to tell a specific story. In this light, he states, "Almost the entire content of I Sam., chs. 9 to 31, remains to be interpreted."[272] While Knierim's article is somewhat dated, source-critical scholarship and a focus on the succession narrative has largely continued to dominate the scholarly landscape of 1 and 2 Samuel. Therefore, his article continues to stand out as making a unique contribution. Working through the pertinent discussions with his interpretive strategy in mind, Knierim concludes, "Furthermore, it is clear that the prophetic circles have written a theology of the failure of the messiah insofar as they speak of Saul. When they speak of David

271.Ibid., 21.

272.Ibid., 22.

they speak of the success of the Messiah."[273] In other words, 1 Samuel 9-31, in its final form, is a messianic story.

4.1.4 - Development of Messianic Concepts

To begin answering the question of the nature and extent of the expectation of the Messianic King, one must also answer another question. When? The genetic and definitional questions are certainly related; however, it is somewhat challenging to decide which takes priority in being answered. One can hardly answer the question of when a thing developed if one does not know what the thing is. On the other hand, given the chronological scope of the data that one must survey in order to answer definitional questions, one must be aware of the possibility of development. The difficult relationship between the genetic and definitional questions and the role one's presuppositions play in determining both the process and the conclusion to the matter is seen clearly in a survey of the scholarship on the matter.

Collins is undoubtedly correct in his critical observation, "The traditional assumption, at least in Christian circles, has been that messianic ex-

273.Ibid., 42.

pectation was ubiquitous and had a consistent form."[274] Collins offers a quick overview of the scholarship on this matter. On one end of the spectrum, he cites Schuerer and Moore as proceeding "on the assumption that there was a uniform system of messianic expectation in ancient Judaism."[275] On the other end of the spectrum, one finds J.H. Charlesworth stating, "For the most part, I am convinced, Jewish messianology developed out of the crisis and hope of the nonmessianic Maccabean wars of the second Century B.C.E."[276] and "No member of the Princeton Symposium on the Messiah holds that a critical historian can refer to a common Jewish messianic hope during the time of Jesus or in the sayings of Jesus."[277] Charlesworth sees Jewish messianology as both a late and very inconsistent development. Certainly, both ends of the spectrum seem overstated in their separate ways; nonetheless, the question is raised, was there development in the nature and extent of expectation of a Messianic King?

---

274. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 3.

275. Ibid.,

276. *The Messiah*, 3.

277. Ibid., 5.

If, with Mowinckel, one defines messiah with necessarily eschatological import[278] and eschatology in decidedly apocalyptical terms[279] then perhaps one would find less development in the idea simply because the idea would be absent before the later development of Jewish apocalyptical thought. On the other hand, if one defines messiah more broadly to include Mowinckel's future hope, which is national restoration and not necessarily eschatological or apocalyptic, then one would perhaps find greater development. However, in seeking to define terms, where do we begin? If one begins with a predetermined definition of messiah or Messianic King, there is a high probability of either importing extra-biblical and anachronistic ideas onto the text, pre-determining a desired conclusion via the chosen definition, or both. Richard Horsley offers helpful insight on the way forward in the present discussion. Regarding the use of messianic language, he writes,

> Use of the terms 'messiah/messianic' would thus be confined to literary and historical phenomena (a) where the Hebrew term 'messiah' or its equivalent occurs, (b) where another term that can be clearly established as closely associated occurs, or (c) where a

278.Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 3ff.

279.Ibid., 125.

particular social-historical form is evident that has previously been associated with the term.[280]

4.2 - Chapter 4 Questions

Horsley correctly recognizes the various currents at work in discussions about messianism in ancient Israel. Despite the limits of the current project, if one is to venture into the discussion of Old Testament Messianism, something must be said regarding each Horsley's categories. To that end, we will briefly examine both the occurrences of anointing language and the broader development of the messianic concept. Such language and concepts will be examined in order to answer two key questions:

1. To what degree is there agreement between the book of Samuel and the rest of the Old Testament regarding the nature and extent of expectation of a Messianic King?

280. Richard A. Horsley, "Messianic Movements in Judaism," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Volume 4, K-N,* ed. David Noel Freedman, (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 791.

2. To what degree is bringing divine judgement a fundamental aspect of the Messianic King in the book of Samuel and the rest of the Old Testament?

While the first question could undoubtedly be pursued as a lengthy study in its own right, a general overview of the topic following Horsley's first confinement will serve the current research purpose well by providing a general understanding of the Old Testament's view of the king and the messiah as he relates both to the divine and the eschatological, allowing us to examine the consistency of the use of these concepts in the books of Samuel over against the rest of the Old Testament. While there are several of lexical studies on מָשִׁיחַ and its cognates, there is still value in revisiting the data. Certainly gaining a full understanding of Old Testament Messianism requires more than a simple lexical study, but it just as certainly does not require less. Though the lexical study has been revisited numerous times, beginning afresh at this point helps guard against anachronistic readings of later messianic thought into the Old Testament. As the stated goal of the research is an examination of the popular Christo-logical readings the David and Goliath narrative and the possibility of reading the narrative as a messianic text in its own right against its Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern backgrounds without importing later theological developments, there is particular value for the current

study to guard against importing later thought. Following the lexical study, we will interact with more broad formulations of messiah in the Old Testament, particularly as it pertains to the relationship between messiah and king.

The second question in this chapter will set the stage for beginning to understand how the overlap that exists between the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative and the literary and narrative parallels in the Old Testament and Ancient Near East inform one's understanding of both the function of the David and Goliath narrative in the context of Samuel and the function of Samuel as a whole.

4.3 - To what degree is there agreement between the book of Samuel and the rest of the Old Testament regarding the nature and extent of expectation of a Messianic King?

In examining this question, two concepts are in view, kingship and messianism. Both ideas are worthy of exploration in their own right. Therefore we will consider them separately before taking them together as a compound concept. Such exploration will allow us both to let the full weight of the individual concepts inform our understanding the compound concept and in turn to better understand how the ideas of king-

ship, messiah, and Messianic King are found in book of Samuel and, to what degree such concepts should inform one's interpretation of the book of Samuel and the David and Goliath narrative.

4.3.1 - Kingship

Of the more than two thousand mentions of a king in the Hebrew canon, the vast majority are simply in reference to someone serving as a king and are only marginally instructive for understanding either Yahweh's or the people's expectations for a king. Perhaps the most instructive passage in understanding Hebrew kingship is Deuteronomy 17:14-20. From this passage, one can make several observations regarding the nature of kingship in Israel.

1. An Israelite monarchy is permissible.

2. The king must be a Hebrew.

3. The king must not be self-serving.

4. The king must not cause the people to return to Egypt.

5. The king must be governed by the law of God.

6. The king's and his people's existence in the kingdom is dependent on the king's faithfulness to the law.

In addition to Deuteronomy 17, three passages in 1 Samuel are helpful in understanding the shape of kingship in Israel. Hannah's prayer in 1 Samuel 2 ends with the expectation of Yahweh empowering his king, here also referred to as "his anointed,"[281] to shatter the enemies of Yahweh. Similarly, Samuel's anointing of Saul as recorded in 1 Samuel 9:16 includes a reference to the king's role in saving Israel from her enemies, the Philistines. 1 Samuel 10:1 is perhaps another reference to the expectation that the king will save Israel from her enemies; however, caution is advised in the use of this text due to the substantial textual variant between the Masoretic Text and the LXX which preserves a longer reading in which is found the language of the king saving Israel from her enemies. Both Klein and McCarter see the longer reading preserved in the LXX as original, the former explaining the shortened MT via homoioarchton[282] the latter via haplography[283]. Other scholars, such as Tsumura, take the shorter reading of the MT as original[284]. Regardless of

281.1 Sm 2:10

282.Klein, *Samuel*, 83.

283.McCarter Jr., *Samuel*, 171.

284.Tsumura, *Samuel*, 281-282.

whether one gives precedence to the Masoretic or LXX reading of 1 Samuel 10:1, there is a clear expectation of monarchical defense in Israel that, while not standing against the Deuteronomic expectation of a king, can be added to those points developed from Deuteronomy 17.

Following his extended discussion on both the dependence and independence of Israelite concepts of kingship on other ancient Near Eastern concepts and the biblical data, Mowinckel provides a helpful summary of kingship in Israel.

> If the king is what he ought to be, he is also the guarantee of the people's future and good fortune, its 'righteousness' and 'peace'. He is the leader in war, and in the power of Yahweh subdues all enemies. He is the supreme judge, the guardian of justice and righteousness. He is the guarantee of fertility and prosperity. All the victory and blessing which Yahweh creates for His people by His advent at the festival are brought to realization by the king, if he is a righteous king after Yahweh's heart. Then the association works as it ought, and Yahweh bestows power and good fortune for the maintenance of peace, justice, and prosperity. Neither the king nor the cult creates these things; Yahweh Himself creates and bestows them through the

sacramental cultic acts and through the king's right relation to Yahweh.[285]

4.3.1.A - Conclusions on Kingship

While kings are prevalent throughout the Old Testament, the vast majority of occurrences are descriptive and only marginally helpful for understanding the expectations of the king of Israel. From the few passages that offer prescriptive statements for the king of Israel, one can conclude that the king of Israel is a divinely appointed figure who is both subservient to Yahweh and the earthly political arm of Yahweh working in the civil realm to maintain and enforce the covenant which Yahweh has established with his people. Further, the expectation of kingship found in the Samuel corpus is not substantially different from the Deuteronomy 17 expectation.

285.Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 89.

4.3.2 - Messiah

A survey of מָשַׁח and its cognates produces one hundred and twenty-five OT references. יָצַק שֶׁמֶן is a far less common construction to refer to anointing, and its inclusion brings the count of anointing texts to one hundred and thirty-two. Of these one hundred and thirty-two verses, three refer to Jacob's pillar, four are standalone references, five refer to the people of God, fifty-eight refer to the priesthood, temple, or some aspect of the levitical system, and sixty-two refer to the king.[286]

In order to give much-needed structure to our discussion of anointing, four aspects of anointing will be considered: 1) the subject of the anointing; 2) the object of the anointing; 3) the purpose of the anointing; and 4) nominal uses.

286.Jgs 9:8, 15; 1 Sm 2:10, 35, 9:16, 10:1, 12:3, 5, 15:1, 17, 16:3, 6, 12-13, 24:6, 10, 26:9, 11, 16, 23; 2 Sm 1:14, 16, 2:4, 7, 3:39, 5:3, 17, 12:7, 19:10, 21, 22:51, 23:1; 1Kgs 1:34, 39, 45, 5:1, 19:15-16; 2 Kgs 9:3, 6, 12, 11:12, 23:30; Is 45:1; Ps 2:2, 18:51(50), 20:6, 45:7, 89:20, 38, 51, 132:10, 17; Lam 4:20; Dn 9:25-26; 1Chr 11:3, 14:8, 29:22; 2Chr 6:42, 22:7, 23:11

4.3.2.A - Subject of the Anointing

There are fifty-five occurrences in which the anointer is explicit. Of these fifty-five occurrences, three are references to Jacob anointing the pillar, two are references to the parabolic trees anointing a king, and six are undertaken by the people of Israel in general. In these examples the anointer is expressed as the "men of Judah" (2 Sm 2:4, 7), the people, (2 Sm 19:10), "people of the land" (2 Kgs 23:30), people anointing themselves (Am 6:6), and "the assembly" (1 Chr 29:22).

Thirty-seven times the subject is someone holding an official role within Israel (e.g. Moses, Samuel, a prophet, a priest, the elders), and seven of the times when the subject is an official they are explicitly said to be anointing "for Yahweh" or their actions are explicitly ascribed to Yahweh (1 Sm 10:1, 15:1, 16:3, 12; 2 Kgs 9:3, 6 12). When one adds to these explicit statements the general understanding of Moses, Samuel, the prophets, and the priests acting as Yahweh's agents it is entirely reasonable to understand not only the seven references with explicit mention of divine backing but all examples of anointing at the hands of an Israelite official as carrying the weight of divine backing at some level.

Of the fifty-five occurrences of anointing with an explicit subject, Elohim or Yahweh is said to be the one anointing the object seven times. These seven examples of Yahweh being the anointer are in addition to the seven mentioned above in which a person is anointing the object in the name of Yahweh. Those anointed by Yahweh are Aaron and his sons (Lv 7:36), Saul (1 Sm 10:1[LXX], 15:1, 17), David (1 Sm 16:3, 12; 12:7; Ps 89:20), Jehu (2 Kgs 9:3, 6, 12; 2 Chr 22:7), the one who will bring good news to the poor (Is 61:1), and an unspecified king (Ps 45:7). Each of the figures anointed by Yahweh or in Yahweh's name by his official are significant in that they are either the first of a class (Aaron, Saul, who was rejected for his failure, and David, Saul's replacement), given a specific and significant task in Israel's history (Jehu and the one proclaiming good news), or presented as a prototypical figure (the king in the "Love Song").

4.3.2.B - Object of the Anointing

One hundred and two instances of anointing specify the object of anointing. Thirty-five times the object of anointing is related to the tabernacle, the priests, or the accoutrements thereof. Of the remaining sixty-seven objects of anointing six references are to an object, and the rest are to a

person being anointed. The six references are a tree and bramble the latter of which is anointed king in Judges 9, Jacob's pillar, which is mentioned three times (Gn 28:18, 31:13. and 35:14), and "the shield", which the princes are called to anoint, presumably calling for battle readiness, in Isaiah 21:5.

Of the sixty-one references to a person being anointed, one finds Elisha (1 Kgs 19:16 wherein Nimshi is also anointed king), two unnamed prophets (Is 61:1 along with Ps 105:15 and 1 Chr 16:22 which are redundant), the people who indulgently anoint themselves (Am 6:6), the people of God (Hb 3:13), and Zadok the priest (1 Chr 29:22 wherein Solomon is also anointed as king).

The remaining fifty-six references to a person being anointed are to a king. Two are foreign kings: Hazael is anointed king of Syria by Elijah in 1 Kings 19 and Cyrus, king of Persia, is said to be the Yahweh's anointed. There are fifteen anointings of various named and unnamed kings: unnamed kings (1 Sm 2:10, Ps 2:2, 20:6, 45:7); Absalom (2 Sm 19:10); Nimshi (1 Kgs 19:16); Jehu (2 Kgs 9:3, 6, 12 and 2 Chr 23:11); Jehoahaz (2 Kgs 23:30); and an unnamed prince (Dn 9:25-26). Of these fifteen anointings, only Jehu and the king of Psalm 45:7 are said to be anointed by Yahweh or Elohim. Additionally, the unnamed kings of

Psalm 2:2 and 20:6 are called Yahweh's anointed. Saul (13x), David (21x), and Solomon (5x) make up the remaining thirty-nine objects of anointings.

Far and away, the objects of anointing are either priestly or kingly in nature. Saul and David comprise more than half of the kingly objects of anointing. Likewise, Saul and David make up half of all objects of anointing said to be anointed directly by Yahweh or for Yahweh via an official representative.

4.3.2.C - Purpose of the Anointing

In sixty of the references to anointing, a specific purpose is announced. Jacob's anointing of the pillar at Bethel is somewhat of an outlier in that the purpose does not have a discernible communal aspect to it. All other stated purposes for anointing are, in some way, communal and can be categorized either as qualitative or functional.

One qualitative purpose is given, "to consecrate" or "to be holy", and it is found in fourteen instances of anointing. Eleven instances refer to the tabernacle and its furniture and utensils. Only five references are to people, and these are all priests, once an unnamed priest is the object (Lv

21:10) and four times Aaron and his sons are the objects (Ex 30:30, 40:13, Lv 8:12, 30).

Forty-five times the purpose of anointing is functional. There is one reference to being a prophet (1 Kgs 19:16) and one reference to announcing a prophetic message (Is 61:1). Ten times the purpose of anointing is to serve as priest. Zadok is anointed to be a priest in 1 Chronicles 29:22. An unspecified, succeeding priest is referenced in Leviticus 16:32. All other references are to Aaron and his sons at the establishment of the priesthood. Thirty-five instances of anointing are to make someone king. Very occasionally a more specific task of being king is explicitly stated as in the case of Jehu being anointed "to destroy the house of Ahab" (2 Chr 22:7).

Two times Saul is said to be anointed as נָגִיד, "prince," rather than מֶלֶךְ, "king." While scholars have made a great deal of the difference in terms of the cultural evolution of Israel, one cannot overlook that Saul is just as frequently said to have been anointed to be king as prince. This observation leads to the conclusion that whatever cultural evolution may have occurred in Israel's movement from a tribal people to a monarchy, from a literary standpoint, Saul is to be understood within the story as a king. Fourteen times David is anointed for the purpose of being king.

In the vast majority of instances in which an explicit purpose for anointing is announced, that purpose relates to the function for which one is being anointed. The functional purpose most often announced is kingship. While one cannot conclude an exclusive relationship between the ideas of kingship and messiah, one must conclude that the two ideas are understood, at least in part, each in relation to the other.

4.3.2.D - Nominal Uses of Anointing

There are fifty-seven nominal uses of "anointing" and its cognates. Twenty-one references are to the "oil" or "portion" used in cultic practices and are not significant for the present discussion. Three times in Leviticus 4 the word is used to specify the work of "the anointed priest." Two times in Daniel 9, an unknown eschatological figure is referred to as either "an anointed one, a prince" or "an anointed prince." One can make sound arguments for both translations, and neither translation results in a substantially different meaning. Once the people are referred to as Yahweh's anointed (Hb 3:13), once an unspecified figure is termed Yahweh's anointed (Ps 84:9), and twice, in parallel passages, an unspecified prophet is referred to as Yahweh's anointed (Ps 105:15 and 1 Chr 16:22).

The remaining twenty-seven occurrences of Yahweh's anointed are all in reference to a king. Interestingly, Cyrus is referred to in this manner. In 1 Samuel 2:10, 35, Psalm 2:2, and Lamentations 4:20, an unspecified king is titled, "Yahweh's anointed." In 1 Samuel 16:6, Samuel presumes Eliab is "Yahweh's anointed" that is being sought. Psalm 20 is a prayer, attributed to David, asking that Lord would give the king, termed "his anointed" success. Ten times Saul is referred to as "Yahweh's anointed." Eight times this title is used by David about Saul to assert the respect that is necessarily due him as such. The other two Saulide references are Samuel calling him as a witness to his innocence before the people.

David is referred to as Yahweh's anointed ten times. In 2 Samuel 23:1 people are calling for Shimei to be put to death for his part in cursing David, "Yahweh's anointed." Several instances of David as Yahweh's anointed are moments of praise to Yahweh for his steadfast love, salvation, or general faithfulness to his anointed (2 Sm 22:51, 23:1; Ps 18:50, 28:8). Psalm 89:38 and 51 are prayers calling to God to save his anointed. Psalm 132, one of the Psalms of Ascent, prays that God would remember his people and his anointed one before recounting the promises made to Israel and Yahweh's anointed (2 Chr 6:42 is a close parallel with Ps 132). The connection between Israel and the Yahweh's anointed that one sees in Psalm 132 is less explicit in many of the other passages nam-

ing David as Yahweh's anointed but is still present. This connection serves to illustrate that Israel saw its future attached to Yahweh's anointed. This point is further illustrated by the seeking of the death penalty for one who curses Yahweh's anointed.

4.3.2.E - "Messiah" Beyond the Lexemes

Within contemporary messianic scholarship from virtually every quarter, there is a healthy awareness the study of Old Testament Messianism must, of necessity, extend beyond the simple study of specific lexemes and their cognates. McConville rightly summed up the position when he wrote, "Common to all modern treatments of the idea of the Messiah in the Old Testament is the recognition that it cannot be tied to the occurrence of the מָשִׁיחַ ('anointed one'), which is not used in its later technical sense in the Old Testament."[287] J. Daniel Hays goes slightly farther, stating that the use of either the verbal or the nominal forms and their cognates are "not a determining factor in whether or not a text is messianic."[288] While the latter might be an overstatement, for surely the use of such words is *a* determining factor, the point is well taken, whatever

287.McConville, “Messianic Interpretation,”, 2.

288.Hays, “If He Looks Like a Prophet,”, 59-60.

one might gain from even a comprehensive examination of various lexemes is not the whole story regarding Old Testament Messianism. One must also develop the idea of Old Testament Messianism conceptually.

The discussion of messiah in the Old Testament, when developed conceptually, can proceed along several different lines. Common avenues of thought include the offices of prophet, priest, and king, the suffering servant, the messiah in time (present, future, eschatological?), the various stages of understanding of the idea itself in the Hebrew Scriptures, LXX, Rabbinic writings, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the New Testament, how the idea is developed at various points within the canon, the use of "messiah" and other theological constructs (e.g. son of God and son of man), and various other lines. No, one work has, or likely could, grapple with every aspect Old Testament Messianism and its development.

How one proceeds and along which lines, is largely a question of hermeneutics. Hays asks the question that many others have, "What constitutes a messianic text?" On the one hand, this is a rather easy question to answer within one's system of thought and theological commitments. On the other hand, this is a rather difficult question to answer to the satisfaction of any large swath of biblical interpreters. McConville ac-

knowledges the same when he states after a brief overview of the matters,

> The differences which we have noted are revealing. They show that, even within the framework of critical enquiry, there is no unanimity about what might constitute the basic data of messianism. There is no agreed corpus of 'messianic' texts, nor is there a single type of text to which the enquiry must be limited."[289]

Given the stated goal of testing the Christo-logical reading of the David and Goliath narrative to see if such a reading of the text can be maintained when read against its Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern background, many of the modern, theological approaches to Old Testament Messianism, while helpful in general, would be counterproductive for the current project. Instead, for our purposes, we will be better served to follow Van Groningen's lead in seeking to understand how the messianic concept develops throughout the canon with particular emphasis on the Samuel corpus. As has already been noted, Van Groningen posits a narrower concept of messiah regarding the king as the anointed one and a wider concept of messiah. Of the wider concept, he writes,

---

289.McConville, “Messianic Interpretation,”, 5.

> Thus the reference could be to one, a few, or all of the following: (1) the promises of salvation, (2) the work to be executed to carry the promises, (3) the qualifications, (4) the means employed, (5) the goals set, (6) the persons required in addition to the king, (7) the realm over which the Messiah reigns, and (8) the results of his reign.[290]

Van Groningen does not intend in any way to pit the narrower and wider concepts of Messiah against each other as if the two concepts existed in an either-or relationship. Rather, he seeks to show how both are present, and the latter is developed with increasing clarity throughout the Old Testament canon in accord with his view of progressive revelation. In this way, we see that Van Groningen's development of the messiah concept is not an a-theological hermeneutic standing in contrast to other theological interpretations, but takes as its starting point a particular view of revelation through which the Old Testament is viewed in order to develop the idea of messiah rather than a particular view of messiah through which the Old Testament is viewed.[291] Van Groningen is not alone in recognizing the importance of the reality of progressive revelation in our understanding of the text. Tremper Longman III writes concerning the

---

290. Van Groningen, *Messianic Revelation*, 20.

291. Ibid., 21-23.

presence of a messianic concept in the Law and writings, "...even before the Christ event, due to the unfolding drama of the history of redemption and the progress of revelation, the reading of this material changed."[292] Likewise, McConville,

> The interpretation of the Old Testament is not a one-way street, but a two-way flow, in which contemporary situations were compared with the Scriptures, and the Scriptures were then brought to bear, sometimes in (to us) unexpected ways, on the situations. The Old Testament, indeed, underwent a good deal of reinterpretation even as hopes of deliverance were being worked out.[293]

Following Van Groningen in this direction helps guard against the charge that we are only finding in the text that for which we are searching rather than discovering that which is present, a critique to which many works on Old Testament Messianism are open.

Coming then to 1 Samuel one finds numerous clues that a messianism was at work from the very beginning. As has already been stated, Sat-

---

292. Tremper Longman, "The Messiah: Explorations in the Law and Writings," in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments,* ed. Stanley E. Porter, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007), 32.

293. McConville, "Messianic Interpretation,", 12.

terthwaite finds in the organization of Samuel corpus using three key poetic texts good reason to read the narratives contained therein as presentations of David as "the anointed of YHWH."[294] Along similar lines, Van Groningen states, "five specific messianic instances present in 1 Samuel call for a closer study, namely, Hannah's prayer, Samuel's threefold office, Samuel's messianic servanthood, the anointing of Saul, and the anointing of David."[295] Van Groningen goes on to conclude that one finds both his narrower and wider messianic constructs at work not only in the book of Samuel[296] but also throughout the rest of the Hebrew canon, concepts which were particularly developed by the latter prophets. He writes,

> The writing prophets were not the first to speak of a promised Messiah, his character, and his work. Rather, in an organic manner within the crucible of their historical milieu, they progressively unfolded, developed, and applied the messianic concept, a concept revealed and developed to a considerable extent in the Mosaic

294. Satterthwaite, “David in Samuel,”, 43.

295. Van Groningen, *Messianic Revelation*, 269-270.

296. Ibid., 283.

writings, the historical works -- Joshua through 1 Kings 11 -- and in the Wisdom Literature, particularly in the psalms.[297]

4.3.2.F - Conclusions on Messiah

The analysis of Old Testament anointing language in categories of the subject of anointing, the object of anointing, the purpose of anointing, and the nominal uses of anointing allow one to draw the following, preliminary conclusions:

1. Of the anointings in which a subject is specified (55x), the majority (44x) of the time the subject is either an official of Israel (30x), an official acting explicitly for Yahweh (7x), or Yahweh himself (7x). Therefore, one can say, very frequently, and almost always when the subject is specified, anointing carries some level of official, divine endorsement.
2. Of the anointings in which an object is specified (102x) the majority of the time the object is either a Levitical priest or object (36x) or a king (56x). More than half of the latter refer to

297.Ibid., 418-419.

Saul (13x) or David (21x). Therefore, one can say, far beyond half of the recorded objects anointed, are priestly or kingly.

3. Of the anointings in which a purpose of anointing is specified (60x) the majority are qualitative- "to consecrate" (14x), or functional- to be prophet (2x), to be priest (10x), and to be king/ prince (35x). Therefore, one can say, the only stated, qualitative purpose of anointing is consecration, and the most frequently-stated, functional purpose of anointing is kingship.

4. Of the thirty-six nominal uses of anointing not referring to a cultic object (e.g. oil), the majority are to kings (27x). More than half of these refer to Saul (10x) or David (10x). Therefore, one can say, almost always titular references to an anointed object reference a king.

5. As regards the presence of anointing in the book of Samuel in comparison with the rest of the Old Testament, there is general agreement in how the concept is used but heightened frequency in the use of the concept particularly surrounding Saul and David.

6. Looking back once again to Motyer's categories of Old Testament Messianism- election, redemption judgement, dominion, and agency- one finds substantial overlap between

these categories and the lexical data. Anointing implies divine endorsement most frequently of a king whose role is by definition to take dominion and includes both delivering Israel from her enemies and bringing judgment on her foes. Less evident in the raw lexical data is Yahweh's agency through the anointed one, though one might argue such is implied at some level in Yahweh's choice to anoint the person for a particular task.

7. Using Van Groningen's categories of "narrower" and "wider" allows one to see that while there is a development of the messianic idea throughout the canon, there is also consistency to the messianic idea throughout the canon.

In light of these conclusions, one sees a definite, though not exclusive, connection between kingship and anointing, prompting one to examine more closely the concept of Messianic King.

4.3.3 - Messianic Kingship

When one examines references wherein anointing and king are found together in the canon, it is not the case that every instance carries the same import; however, neither is it the case that a definite development

throughout the canon exists. Nonetheless, several observations can be made.

4.3.3.A - Survey of Lexical Data

Of the sixty-three instances wherein anointing and kingship are found together, the subject is specified thirty times. The king was anointed by a non-official or non-divine anointer only seven times. The majority of the time (23x) the anointer of the king is an official of Israel or Yahweh himself. Twelve times the anointer of the king is either an official acting explicitly for Yahweh (7x) or Yahweh himself (5x). Twenty-nine times the king is referred to with the titular "Yahweh's anointed" or "anointed one." No king who was anointed by a non-official is given the title "Yahweh's anointed." Twenty of the titular references are naming either Saul (10x) or David (10x). Each of the references to the king as "Yahweh's Anointed" except one (1 Sm 16:6) is either highlighting the "set-apartness" of Yahweh's anointed (13x) his connection with a future hope for the people of God (13x), or both (2x).

4.3.3.B - 2 Samuel 2:10

Of great importance among the passages that bring kingship and anointing together is 1 Samuel 2:10, which Mowinckel fails to address in his seminal work. 1 Samuel 2:1-10 record Hannah's prayerful praise of Yahweh, which she ends with the following words,

> "Yahweh will put in awe the one who is displaying contention against him,
>
> over him he will thunder in the heavens,
>
> Yahweh will judge the ends of the earth,
>
> and he will give strength to his king,
>
> and he will exalt the horn of his anointed."[298]

Here, is the first reference to a divinely anointed king, "his anointed", who shall be exalted, a king who will be given strength. Whether one finds here a historically early reference to a Messianic King or not is, in some ways, beyond the point.

While multiple translation options exist for the Hebrew imperfect verbs found in Hannah's prayer including as a statement of expected or regular

---

298.1 Samuel 2:10

action, there is good reason to see a poetic shift in how the aspect is used from 2:8 to 2:9-10. First, the first use of a non-volitional, non-consecutive imperfect is found in 2:8 which are thematically related to the previous verses as a statement praise of how Yahweh has acted. 1 Samuel 2:9 introduces a new theme of future protection based on the stated character of Yahweh in his past actions. Second, a future state in which a king brings victory is in view. From a literary standpoint, this must be future as Israel has no king yet. Third, the LXX recognizes this poetic shift in how the aspect is used in verses 9-10. From a literary standpoint, this reference to a future anointed king frames the story that follows in which a monarchy headed by a divinely anointed king is established in Israel. Hannah's prayer announces an expectation of a future anointed king who will protect the faithful of God, cut off the wicked, and operate not in his power but in the strength of Yahweh. In other words, Hannah's prayer sets the expectation for an anointed, Deuteronomic king.[299] Likewise,

---

299.My thinking on this matter was sparked by a comment by Dr. T. Desmond Alexander in a conversation regarding a different issue. In our conversation he mentioned a current doctoral candidate working on the idea of Hannah's song as a thematic introduction to Samuel. Seeing the potential relevance of this topic to the current research I enquired as to the possibility of engaging this candidates work. Due to the work not being complete I was unable to gain access to it, nor have I found it published since our conversation. So while I cannot properly cite this dissertation or

Psalm 2:2, from which "the association of the term [מָשִׁיחַ] with an ideal Davidic king derives"[300] and "which speaks of the subjugation of all the peoples to God's anointed"[301] points to a future and eschatological hope that is connected with the Messianic King.

As mentioned above, Satterthwaite, following Childs,[302] sees Hannah's song in 1 Samuel 2 as one of three key poems forming a "hermeneutical bracket" that offers a self-imposed interpretation of the narratives and its figures, in particular David.[303] Childs states, "Both the hymnic introduction of ch. 2 and the thanksgiving psalm at the book's conclusion (ch. 22) establish a dominant eschatological, messianic perspective for the whole."[304] Therefore, not only does Hannah's prayer set an expectation for an anointed, Deuteronomic king, it also serves as a hermeneutical

---

even offer the candidates name, I acknowledge that the mention of the work did in fact plant a seed in my own thinking.

300. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 11.

301. Ibid.

302. Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 271-280.

303. Satterthwaite, “David in Samuel,”, 43.

304. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 278.

key for understanding the narratives it introduces in relation to the expectation of an anointed, Deuteronomic king.

4.3.3.C - "Messianic Kingship" Beyond the Lexemes

When considering the concept of "Messianic Kingship" beyond the lexical data, one is delving into Van Groningen's narrower conception of messiah. He offers the following explanation of his narrower concept, "To say 'messiah' is to say the king who reigned, the reigning king, the promised king, or the king expected to reign."[305] Mowinckel, as has been stated, is more specific in his definition of messiah as the one in whom both political and eschatological hope were to be fulfilled.[306] Whether the eschatological component is included in one's definition of messianic king is a extraordinarily determinative in one's study. Even Mowinckel admits, "The expression 'the Anointed One' does not occur in the Old Testament as a technical term for the Messiah. On the other hand, 'the Anointed One', or 'His', or 'My Anointed One' does occur as the ceremonial religious title of the reigning king in Israel, king 'by the grace of

305. Van Groningen, *Messianic Revelation*, 20.

306. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 7.

God.'"[307] However, as Mowinckel goes on to argue there is undoubtedly a connection between this historical figure and the later developed eschatological figure so that the latter was understood in later Jewish thought to be a "this-worldly figure."[308] Mowinckel's recognition of development of the Messianic concept that is, at some level, in accord with the canonical data regarding the historical figure shows that, even in his view, there is a certain amount of agreement between the concept of the king as "the anointed one" as he is consistently presented in the book of Samuel and the expectation of a messianic king in other parts of the canon. That the idea has developed from one part of the canon to the next as Israel finds herself in different situations in the world is to be expected.

4.3.4 - Conclusions to Question of Agreement between Samuel and Old Testament Expectation

In the analysis of the anointing language, we have focused first on both the use of the lexemes and the syntactical structures rather than the figures who were anointed, the syntactical structures, or the historical development of the Messianic King concept to the exclusion or minimiza-

307.Ibid.

308.Ibid.

tion of how and where lexemes are used. The latter approaches have been followed, frequently leading to a skewed presentation of the actual linguistic data. For example, Mettinger has an excellent analysis of the syntactical structures of the language and the historical development of associated concepts.[309] However, though he admits the value of the lexical work, he only offers brief interaction with individual lexical items stating, "It has been necessary to pay attention to the whole of this material, but I shall not burden the presentation with a survey of the occurrences of each of these words."[310] The loss of the lexical data may inadvertently skew the conclusions by overlooking the weight of data surrounding a particular individual. One may say, as Mettinger does, "Three kings are expressly said to have been anointed by God, viz. Saul, David and Jehu,"[311] and this is certainly true. However, if the three divine anointings are not considered in light of the fact that anointing language is only used of Jehu four times in two scenes whereas anointing language is used with David and Saul more than thirty times in numerous scenes, then it may be easy to overlook the import of the Davidic and Saulide anointings for one's understanding of messianic kingship. When one considers the lexical evidence in light of Hannah's announce-

309. Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 185-208.

310. Ibid., 188.

311. Ibid., 203.

ment of Yahweh's future anointed king, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the Samuel narrative is to be read as the story of the coming anointed king. Such a conclusion fits with Knierim's statement regarding 1 Samuel 9-31 when he concluded, "These observations lead to the conclusion that we have not merely a series of messianic narratives, but rather that the entire history of Saul and I Sam., chs.9 to 31, is designed out of messianic theology."[312] While Knierim is operating from the understanding that the annals of 2 Samuel are the "older, historically more authentic traditions,"[313] he is also operating from the standpoint that the Saulide and Davidic stories were put together to make a particular literary point. This literary point is centered on the expectation of a Messianic King.

Additionally, following Van Groningen, the present research has moved beyond the simple lexemes and syntactical structure to explore the broader concept of Old Testament messianism. Van Groningen's dual categories of narrower and wider concepts of the messiah in the Old Testament prove helpful in that they guard against both overly "'Word-bound' approaches to what really are concepts studies"[314] as is found in

312. Knierim, “The Messianic Concept,”, 28.

313. Ibid., 29.

314. Hays, “If He Looks Like a Prophet,”, 59.

different ways in both Block and Mowinckel, and the many popular, homiletical approaches to the text that take Luke 24:44 as permission to hurdle Spurgeon's famous hedges[315] in order to get to Christ.

Further, regarding the relationship of Israel's understanding of kingship and the Messiah, Mowinckel states, "The conceptions of the king in the old royal ideology and in the doctrine of the Messiah are in all their main features identical."[316] Given what has been shown regarding both kingship and the understanding of the Messiah in Israel, Mowinckel's position that there was a strong connection between the two makes sense. Even though Mowinckel argued for a lack of presence of a Messianic King in the Old Testament, he still maintained, 'the Anointed One', or 'His', or 'My Anointed One' does occur as the ceremonial religious title for the reigning king in Israel, king 'by the grace of God.'"[317]

With the previous observations about kingship and the preliminary conclusions about the use of anointing language in the Old Testament, one can now draw the following conclusions. From Deuteronomy 17 on, one finds a consistent expectation of a king who will act for the people in the

---

315.C.H. Spurgeon, *The Soul-Winner; or, How to Lead Sinners to the Saviour* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1895), 99.

316.Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 20.

317.Ibid., 7.

power of Yahweh. Depending on the point in Israel's history that one finds this king being discussed, he may be discussed as one protecting the people, as one saving the people, or as one reestablishing the people. Likewise, there is a consistent presentation of an anointed figure who acts both for the people and for Yahweh. In the canon of the Old Testament, there is a drawing together of the concepts of kingship and messiah such that there is a consistent presentation of a kingly, messianic figure, who is purposefully and divinely set apart and to whom the hope of Israel is attached via his responsibility to maintain and enforce the covenant. While one can only go beyond this statement with great care regarding the nature and extent of the expectation of a Messianic King, one is not doing justice to what is presented in the text if at least this much is not acknowledged. Indeed, even if one follows the rather careful use of the term according to the guidelines found in Horsley's article, such general conclusions are inescapable. Further, one must recognize that while there is a heightened presence of a Messianic King in the book of Samuel, largely centered on Saul and David, and one must also recognize the substantial overlap between how the compound idea of Messianic King and its constituent parts are presented in Samuel and elsewhere in the Old Testament. Recognizing the overlap in the presentation and use of the idea of a Messianic King will inevitably impact

one's interpretation of both 1 Samuel 17 and the book of Samuel as a whole.

With the general understanding in mind, several more narrow questions could be asked regarding the concept of a Messianic King. Given the connection shown in chapters 1 and 2 between taunting language and judgement, and the overlap between the use of taunting language in service to the establishment, maintenance, and enforcement of covenants and the role of Messianic King to maintain and enforce the covenant, the more narrow question that follows the general study of the concept of a Messianic King that is pertinent to the present discussion is the degree to which divine judgement is a fundamental aspect of the concept of the Messianic King.

4.4 - To what degree is bringing divine judgement a fundamental aspect of the Messianic King?

As noted before by Mettinger, "Three kings are expressly said to have been anointed by God, viz. Saul, David and Jehu,"[318] and each of these men was anointed as king for a specific purpose. A survey of these three kings will provide helpful data in understanding the role of the Messian-

318.Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 203.

ic King in bringing divine judgement a point that must be considered in one's interpretation of the David and Goliath narrative given what has been shown regarding the function of the taunting language in 1 Samuel 17.

4.4.1 - Saul

Saul is a fascinating figure in this discussion. We read in 1 Samuel 8 both that his being appointed king over Israel was in response to the people's rejection of Yahweh as their king and that his being appointed king came with a warning from Yahweh that included the threat that Yahweh would not listen to them when they called out to him because of the king's oppression of them. Similar warnings are found at every recapitulation of Saul's anointing. Further, when Samuel is told to anoint Saul as king, Yahweh states, "He will save my people from the hand of the Philistines; because, I have seen my people; because, their cry has come to me." Later, Samuel is sent to Saul with the following message from Yahweh, "I have paid attention to what Amalek did to Israel, what he did to him in the way when he came up out of Egypt. Now, go and strike Amalek and devote to destruction all that is to him."[319] Saul is indeed an

319.1 Sm 15:2b-3a

interesting figure in the current discussion for he is presented in some regard both as a judgment against Israel for their rejection of Yahweh as King and as the means by which Yahweh would deliver Israel from her oppressors, judging the oppressors of Israel by devoting them to utter destruction.

4.4.2 - David

When Saul is rejected as king and David is anointed in his place, the call for deliverance from the Philistines remains and the burden is transferred to David as seen in the story of David and Goliath which follows David's anointing, a scene which Knierim argues fits the pattern noted by Von Rad wherein "the call is followed immediately by the public proof of the charisma effected by means of a victory over the enemy."[320] While David is not given the same commission as Saul, his actions to complete what Saul could not in regard to the Philistines highlight the vocational congruity. In addition, Psalm 2 connects the Davidic king with divine judgment by presenting the opposed messiah, who is syn-

320.Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Traditions*, trans. D.M.G. Stalker, vol. 1 (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962), 329. and Knierim, "The Messianic Concept,", 26.

onymous with the king on Zion, and the son whose anger burns quickly as one figure.

4.4.3 - Jehu

The purpose attached to Jehu's anointing is very specific. When the servant of the prophet anoints Jehu, he does so saying, "Thus said Yahweh, the God of Israel, 'I anoint you for king over the people of Yahweh, over Israel. And you will smite the house of Ahab, your master, and you will avenge the blood of my servants, the prophets, and the blood of all the servants of Yahweh from the hand of Jezebel.'"[321] It is in this context that one finds the passage of Jezebel being fed to the dogs, which, as an example of non-burial involving carrion animals has already been shown to be a judgement scene.

4.4.4 - Conclusions Regarding Judgement and Messianic KingshipMessianic Kingship

From these three examples of divinely anointed kings, one sees that divine judgement is part and parcel to the idea of a Messianic King. While

321.2 Kings 9:6b-7

this judgment may be directed at Israel in the case of Saul, it is usually directed against the enemies of the people of Yahweh. Therefore, in so far as both the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative and the concept of Messianic King invoke the ideas of divine judgement, a reading of that narrative as an example of David acting as the Messianic King to bring judgement on the enemies of Yahweh would be consistent.

4.5 - Chapter Conclusions

The nature and extent of the expectation of a Messianic King have been explored from various angles. In the current work, we explored this great theme first through a linguistic analysis of the "king" and "anointing" language with an eye to the patterns of use in the book of Samuel and the rest of the Old Testament then by an examination of messiah as a broader concept. By examining the subject, object, and purpose of anointing alongside the nominal uses of anointing, we were able to conclude that there was a purposeful literary drawing together of the themes of kingship and anointing in order to consistently present a kingly, messianic figure who is Yahweh's anointed. Further, we were able to show that the divinely anointed king necessarily carried with him the authority and power to bring about divine judgement on the enemies of Israel

thereby offering Israel a hopeful vision for her future via the expectation of the coming of the king, Yahweh's anointed. While these ideas are somewhat more developed in the book of Samuel, they are not found to be substantially different there than in the rest of the Old Testament. Indeed throughout the Old Testament canon, the king of Israel is presented as the one who is to maintain and enforce the covenant, in particular the political aspects. This role of the king of Israel is only heightened when the concepts of king and messiah are brought together. In this light, there seems to be a substantial correspondence between the purposeful use of threats of non-burial and corpse abuse by carrion-eating animals and the work of the Messianic King.

5 - Chapter 5: Conclusions

The significance of the taunting language in the David and Goliath narrative has long been recognized. However, a close look at the use of this and similar language throughout Scripture, a comparative, linguistic study with Ancient Near Eastern sources, and an analysis of the overlap between the function of taunting language and the function of the messianic theme of 1 Samuel has not been undertaken until now. By examining these elements, this paper has provided a more thorough look at the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative, how this language functions in its immediate context, and how it casts the David and Goliath narrative as a critical piece of the broader, messianic story being told throughout 1 Samuel.

5.1 - Chapter 2: The Old Testament Judgment Language of Birds and Beasts Feasting on Fallen Enemies of Yahweh

Acknowledging the syntactical structure of the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative in 1 Samuel 17 raises questions as to the function of the taunting language in this well-known story. By examining the lexical data, we were able to show that the taunting language of

David and Goliath is far from simple playground trash talk but carried with it great significance for the story. The numerous biblical parallels that were identified showed that the pre-battle taunting of David and Goliath was of the pattern of language that carried with it both individual and corporate eschatological undertones stemming from the parallel curse language found in Deuteronomy 28:26. By examining the syntactical and lexical data of the curse language found in the David and Goliath narrative, we were able to show that such language is paradigmatic and used rhetorically to communicate divine judgment and eschatological realities in a covenantal context. With such themes, a case is also made for the presence of messianic themes in the presentation of David as Yahweh's chosen king through whom he delivered Israel from the Philistines, first announcing judgement on them and then conquering them.

5.2 - Chapter 3: The Rhetoric of the David and Goliath Narrative in Its Canonical and Social Context

Communicating ideas of divine judgement and eschatological realities in a covenantal context through taunting and non-burial language was not unique to the Biblical story. Both linguistic and narrative parallels were found throughout Ancient Near Eastern sources with non-burial lan-

guage and single, representative combat being used to communicate Ancient Near Eastern ideas of divine judgment and future hope or despair in covenantal contexts that are parallel to the biblical ideas attached to the same language. In other words, the biblical authors were not creating an entirely new mode of communication but were employing Ancient Near Eastern literary convention to tell their story. These parallels highlighted the rhetorical function of the text in terms of covenant, judgement, the prospect of existence in the afterlife, and the offended deity or suzerain. The multiplication of rhetorical devices (taunting language, threats of non-burial via carrion-eating animals, single/representative combat, etc.) in the David and Goliath story points to a very purposeful story being told for a very particular purpose. That the rhetorical function of the Anceint Near Eastern literary parallels that were examined deal with ideas consistent with many of the ideas of Old Testament Messianism- and that there existed established literary forms that communicated such ideas consistent with the intended message, introduces the idea that it could be advantageous to employ those forms to one's own literary ends.

5.3 - Chapter 4: David as Messianic King

With this in mind, we were able to examine the kingship and messianic themes as they appeared in the Old Testament and found both consistencies between the concept in Samuel and the rest of the Old Testament canon and overlap between the content of these themes and the rhetorical function of the non-burial language in the story of David and Goliath. With these pieces in place, we can now say, the story of David and Goliath is the literary legitimation and presentation to Israel of the Messianic King who would, as Yahweh's anointed, protect and defend the people of Yahweh by conquering their enemy who had challenged Yahweh's place as suzerain of his people. In so far as eschatological themes are introduced through the threats of non-burial breathed out by both David and Goliath in the names of their respective deities, we have in this story the literary legitimation and presentation of the one on whom Israel will base her hope. In other words, David is the Messianic King who will maintain and enforce the covenant between Yahweh and his people for all the world to see.

When one reads the story of David and Goliath in light of rhetorical function, a reading very different from many of the popular readings comes to the fore. Rather than a story stuck at an impasse of critical dis-

cussions, we have a story intentionally designed to "do theology" and offer categories within which the people of God can comprehend their standing with Yahweh as his people. Rather than a mere reporting of history, we have a text that speaks to Israel's future. Rather than a simple moralistic story about trusting Yahweh and facing your giants, we have a story of divine promise being fulfilled. Returning to the stated goal of testing the Christo-centric reading of I Samuel 17 that claims David is a typological picture of Christ who subdues his people to himself, rules and defends them, and restrains and conquers his and their enemies,[322] the present work has shown that in so far as the taunting language of the David and Goliath narrative stand at the rhetorical and theological center of the story, such a reading is not cut loose from the text but accords with a reading of the narrative in light of both the biblical and the broader Ancient Near Eastern literary context.

5.4 - Further Research

While this research has shed new light on the significance of a rather well known and oft-repeated Old Testament scene, there remain a great

322. *The Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms With Proof Texts* (Lawrenceville: The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 2007), 369-370.

many questions to take up. Having explored how the biblical and Ancient Near Eastern contexts and themes help uncover the meaning and purpose of this single narrative, one must now continue around the hermeneutical spiral to consider what new light such a reading might shed on our understanding of the Saul Cycle, History of David's Rise, and Succession Narrative. Further questions remain to be explored of how the story of David and Goliath contributed both to later Jewish apocalyptic readings of David and the development of a fuller messianic expectation as well as later Christian presentations of Jesus as the Messianic King who brought the kingdom of God and conquered his peoples true eschatological enemy. Of particular interest to Christians will be an exploration of how the story of David and Goliath foreshadows the coming victory of Christ described in Revelation 19 in terms of the flesh of the enemies of rider on the white horse being devoured by carrion-eating birds and beasts and how the developed messianic idea found in Jesus Christ can shine light back onto the David and Goliath narrative.

6 - Bibliography

Abusch, Tzvi. “Mesopotamian Anti-Witchcraft Literature: Texts and Studies Part I: The Nature of Maqlû: Its Character, Divisions, and Calendrical Setting.” Journal of Near Eastern Studies 33, no. 2 (1974): 251-262.

———. Mesopotamian Witchcraft: Towards a History and Understanding of Babylonian Witchcraft Beliefs and Literature. Vol. 5. Ancient Magic and Divination, Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Alexander, Philip S. “The King Messiah in Rabbinic Judaism.” In King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar, ed. John Day, 456-473. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Alter, Robert. The Art of Biblical Narrative. 2nd ed. New York: Basic Books, 2011.

Auld, A. Graeme, and Craig Y.S. Ho. “The Making of David and Goliath.” Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 56, (1992): 19-39.

Baldwin, Joyce G. 1 and 2 Samuel. Vol. 8. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008.

Barthélemy, Dominique, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism Papers of a Joint Research Venture. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires, 1986.

Barton, John. "The Messiah in Old Testament Theology." In King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar, ed. John Day, 365-379. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Bergen, Robert D. 1, 2 Samuel: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture. Vol. 7. The New American Commentary, Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 1996.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Another Contribution to the Succession Narrative Debate (2 Samuel 11-20; 1 Kings 1-2)." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 38, no. 1 (2013): 35-58.

Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth. Judahite Burial Practices and Beliefs About the Dead. A&C Black, 1992.

Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth M. “The Cult of the Dead in Judah: Interpreting the Material Remains.” Journal of Biblical Literature 111, no. 2 (1992): 213-224.

Block, Daniel I. “My Servant David: Ancient Israel’s Vision of the Messiah.” In Israel’s Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, ed. Richard S. Hess, and M. Daniel Carroll, 17-56. Eugenie, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003.

Brichto, Herbert Chanan. “Kin, Cult, Land and Afterlife—a Biblical Complex.” Hebrew Union College Annual 44, (1973): 1-54.

Bright, John. “I and Ii Samuel.” Interpretation 5, no. 4 (1951): 450-461.

Brooke, George J. “Kingship and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar, ed. John Day, 434-455. 2013.

Brueggemann, Walter. First and Second Samuel. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, ed. James Luther. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990.

Campbell, Anthony F. 1 Samuel. Vol. VII. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature, ed. Rolf P. Knierim, and Marvin A. Sweeney. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003.

Carroll R., M. Daniel. “New Lenses to Establish Messiah’s Identity?: A Response to Daniel I. Block.” In Israel’s Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, ed. Richard S. Hess, and M. Daniel Carroll, 71-81. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003.

Chapman, Stephen B. 1 Samuel as Christian Scripture: A Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2016.

The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. ed. James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Childs, Brevard S. Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

———. “Death and Dying in Old Testament Theology.” In Love and Death in the Ancient Near East. Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope, ed. John H. Marks, and Robert M. Good, 89-91. Guilford, CT: Four Quarters, 1987.

Christensen, Duane L. Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12. Vol. 6B. Word Biblical Commentary, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, David Allen Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2002.

Collins, Adela Yarbro, and John J. Collins. King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2008.

Collins, John J. The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature. The Anchor Bible Reference Library, New York: Doubleday, 1995.

———. "Mowinckel's He That Cometh Revisited." Studia Theologica 61, no. 1 (2007): 3-20.

Craigie, Peter C. The Book of Deuteronomy. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, ed. R.K. Harrison, and Robert L. Hubbard Jr. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eaerdmans Publishing Co., 1976.

Cross, Frank Moore. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar. Library of Hebrew Bible/old Testament Studies, ed. John Day. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Day, John. “The Canaanite Inheritance of the Israelite Monarchy.” In King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar, ed. John Day, 72-90. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

de Vaux, Roland. The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Translated by Damian McHugh. First American ed. London: Doubleday, 1972.

Eaton, Margaret R. “Some Instances of Flyting in the Hebrew Bible.” Journal for the Study of the Old Supplement … 61, (1994): 3-14.

Fensham, F. Charles. “Malediction and Benediction in Ancient Near Eastern Vassal-Treaties and the Old Testament.” Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 74, no. 1 (1962): 1-9.

———. “Clauses of Protection in Hittite Vassal-Treaties and the Old Testament.” Vetus Testamentum 13, no. Fasc. 2 (1963): 133-143.

———. “Common Trends in Curses of the Near Eastern Treaties and Kudurru-Inscriptions Compared With Maledictions of Amos and Isaiah.”

Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 75, no. 2 (1963): 155-175.

Firth, David. "'That the World May Know.' Narrative Poetics in 1 Samuel 16-17." In Text & Task: Scripture and Mission, ed. Michael Parsons, 20-32. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2012.

Firth, David G. 1 & 2 Samuel. Vol. 8. Apollos Old Testament Commentary, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2009.

Flanagan, James W. "Chiefs in Israel." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 6, no. 20 (1981): 47-73.

Fokkelman, J.P. Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel: A Full Interpretation Based on Stylistic and Structural Analysis, Volume Ii: The Crossing Fates (I Sam. 13-31 & Ii Sam. 1). Vol. 23. Studia Semitica Neerlandica, Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Frolov, Serge, and Allen Wright. "Homeric and Ancient Near Eastern Intertextuality in 1 Samuel 17." Journal of Biblical Literature 130, no. 3 (2011):

Gevirtz, Stanley. "Curse Motifs in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East." University of Chicago, 1959.

———. “West-Semitic Curses and the Problem of the Origins of Hebrew Law.” Vetus Testamentum 11, no. Fasc. 2 (1961): 137-158.

Gladwell, Malcolm. David and Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and the Art of Battling Giants. London: Allen Lane, 2014.

Goldsworthy, Graeme. Christ-Centered Biblical Theology: Hermeneutical Foundations and Principles. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012.

Gordon, Cyrus H. “Homer and Bible: The Origin and Character of East Mediterranean Literature.” Hebrew Union College Annual 26, (1955): 43-108.

Greengus, Samuel. “The Old Babylonian Marriage Contract.” Journal of the American Oriental Society (1969): 505-532.

Greidanus, Sydney. Preaching Christ From the Old Testament: A Contemporary Hermeneutical Method. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Halpern, Baruch. David’s Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2004.

Hays, Christopher B. Death in the Iron Age Ii and in First Isaiah. Vol. 79. Forschungen Zum Alten Testament, Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Hays, J. Daniel. “If He Looks Like a Prophet and Talks Like a Prophet, Then He Must be…: A Response to Daniel I. Block.” In Israel’s Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, ed. Richard S. Hess, and M. Daniel Carroll, 57-69. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003.

Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. I & Ii Samuel: A Commentary. Translated by J.S. Bowden. The Old Testament Library, ed. Peter Ackroyd, James Barr, Anderson, Bernhard W, and John Bright. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Hillers, Delbert R. “Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets.” Johns Hopkins University, 1964.

Hoffner Jr, Harry A. “A Hittite Analogue to the David and Goliath Contest of Champions.” Catholic Biblical Quarterly 30, no. 2 (1968): 220-225.

Hoffner, Harry A. “Propaganda and Political Justification in Hittite Historiography.” ed. Hans Goedicke, and Jimmy Jack MacBee Roberts, 49-62. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.

Horbury, William. “Messianism in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudipigrapha.” In King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar, ed. John Day, 402-433. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Horsley, Richard A. “Messianic Movements in Judaism.” In The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Volume 4, K-N, ed. David Noel Freedman, New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Huffmon, Herbert B. “The Treaty Background of Hebrew Yāda.” Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 181, (1966): 31-37.

Huffmon, Herbert B., and Simon B. Parker. “A Further Note on the Treaty Background of Hebrew Yāda.” Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 184, (1966): 36-38.

Kelly, Brian E. “Samuel, Books of.” In Dicitonary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible, ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer, 717-720. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Kiuchi, N. “כָּלָב.” In New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis: Volume 2, ed. Willem A. VanGemeren, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.

Klein, Ralph W. 1 Samuel. Vol. 10. Word Biblical Commentary, ed. David Hubbard, and Glenn W. Barker. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.

Knapp, Andrew. “David and Hattushili Iii: The Impact of Genre and a Response to J. Randall Short.” Vetus Testamentum 63, no. 2 (2013): 261-275.

Knierim, Rolf P. “The Messianic Concept in the First Book of Samuel.” In Jesus and the Historian: Written in Honor of E.c. Colwell, ed. F.T. Trotter, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.

Kooij, A. Van der. “The Story of David and Goliath: The Early History of Its Text.” Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 68, no. 1 (1992):

Lamb, David T. “‘’I Will Strike You Down and Cut Off Your Head’ (I Sam 17:46): Trash Talking, Derogatory Rhetoric, and Psychological Warfare in Ancient Israel.” In Warfare, Ritual, and Symbol in Biblical and Modern Contexts, ed. Brad E. Kelle, Frank Richel Ames, and Jacob L. Wright, 111-130. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.

Lemos, T.M. “Shame and Mutilation of Enemies in the Hebrew Bible.” Journal of Biblical Literature 125, no. 2 (2006): 225-241.

Longman, Tremper. “The Messiah: Explorations in the Law and Writings.” In The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments, ed. Stanley E. Porter, 13-34. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007.

Mansen, Frances Dora. “Desecrated Covenant, Deprived Burial: Threats of Non-Burial in the Hebrew Bible.” Boston University, 2015.

McCarter Jr., P. Kyle. “The Apology of David.” Journal of Biblical Literature 99, no. 4 (1980): 489-504.

———. I Samuel. Vol. 8. The Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries, ed. William Foxwell Albright, and David Noel Freedman. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

McConville, J.G. “Messianic Interpretation of the Old Testament in Modern Context.” In The Lord’s Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts, ed. Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham, 1-17. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1995.

———. “King and Messiah in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History.” In King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar, ed. John Day, 271-295. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

McKenzie, Steven L. King David: A Biography. Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press, 2001.

Mendenhall, George E. “Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law.” The Biblical Archaeologist 17, no. 2 (1954): 26-46.

———. “Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition.” The Biblical Archaeologist 17, no. 3 (1954): 50-76.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings. Vol. 8. Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series, ed. Gillis Gerleman, and Helmer Ringgren. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1976.

Motyer, J. Alec. “Messiah.” In New Bible Dictionary, ed. J.D. Douglas, F.F. Bruce, J.I. Packer, N. Hillyer, D. Guthrie, A.F. Millard, and D.J. Wiseman, 763-770. Downers Grove: InterVaristy Press, 1982.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2005.

Noth, Martin. “The Deuteronomistic History.” Journal for the Study of the Old Supplement … 15, (1991):

Olyan, Saul M. “Some Neglected Aspects of Israelite Interment Ideology.” Journal of Biblical Literature 124, no. 4 (2005): 601-616.

Pace, Carl Elliot. “Over My Dead Body: Desecration of the Dead and the Afterlife in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel.” Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, 2015.

Polzin, Robert. Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History. Vol. 2. Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.

Pritchard, James B., Daniel E. Fleming, and William Foxwell Albright. The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures. 1 ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Pritchard, James Bennett. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testamen. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Reimer, Daivd J. “Old Testament Christology.” In King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar, ed. John Day, 380-400. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Renfrew, Colin. “Beyond a Subsistence Economy: The Evolution of Social Organization in Prehistoric Europe.” In Reconstructing Complex Societies, ed. Charlotte B. Moore, 69-88. Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1974.

Roberts, J.J.M. “Whose Child is This? Reflections on the Speaking Voice in Isaiah 9: 5.” Harvard Theological Review 90, no. 2 (1997): 115-129.

Rofé, Alexander. “The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology.” In Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel, ed. Jacob Neusner, Baruch A. Levine, Ernest S. Frerichs, and Caroline McCracken-Flesher, 117-151. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

———. “David Overcomes Goliath (1 Samuel 17).” Henoch 37, no. 1 (2015): 66-100.

Rost, Leonhard. The Succession to the Throne of David. Translated by David Gunn. Bloomsbury Academic Collections: Biblical Studies, New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.

Satterthwaite, Philip E. “David in Th Books of Samuel: A Messianic Hope?” In The Lord’s Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Mes-

sianic Texts, ed. Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham, 41-65. Eugnene: Wipf & Stock, 1995.

Service, Elman R. Primitive Social Organization: An Evolutionary Perspective. Vol. 3. Studies in Anthropolgy, New York: Random House, 1971.

Short, J. Randall. The Surprising Election and Confirmation of King David. Vol. 63. Harvard Theoloigcal Studies, ed. Francois Brown, Francis Schussler Firorenza, and Peter B. Machinist. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Smend, Rudolf. "The Law and the Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History." In Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies in the Deuteronomistic History, ed. Gary N. Knoppers, and J. Gordon McConville, 95-110. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrans, 2000.

Smith, Mark S, and Elizabeth M Bloch-Smith. "Review: Death and Afterlife in Ugarit and Israel." Journal of the American Oriental Society 108, no. 2 (1988): 277-284.

Spurgeon, C.H. The Soul-Winner; or, How to Lead Sinners to the Saviour. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1895.

Stavrakopoulou, Francesca. “Exploring the Garden of Uzza: Death, Burial and Ideologies of Kingship.” Biblica (2006): 1-21.

———. “Gog’s Grave and the Use and Abuse of Corpses in Ezekiel 39: 11–20.” Journal of Biblical Literature 129, no. 1 (2010): 67-84.

———. “Making Bodies: On Body Modification and Religious Materiality in the Hebrew Bible.” Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel 2, no. 4 (2013): 532-553.

Stol, Marten. Women in the Ancient Near East. Translated by Helen and Mervyn Richardson. Boston: Walter de Gruyter Inc., 2016.

Stuart, Douglas. “Curse.” In The Anchor Bible Dicitonaary: Voume 1: A-C, ed. David Noel Freedman, 1218-1219. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Sulyok, Gábor. “Breach of Treaties in the Ancient Near East.” Journal of the History of International Law 20, no. 1 (2018):

The Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms With Proof Texts. Lawrenceville: The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 2007.

Thomas, D. Winton. “Kelebh ‘Dog’: Its Origin and Some Usages of it in the Old Testament.” Vetus Testamentum 10, no. Fasc. 4 (1960): 410-427.

Tigay, Jeffrey H. Deuteronomy. The Jps Torah Commentary, ed. Nahum M. Sarna. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1996.

Tov, Emanuel. The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint. Vol. 72. Vetus Testamentum, Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. 3 ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012.

Tsumura, David Toshio. The First Book of Samuel. New International Commentary on the Old Testament, ed. R.K. Harrison, and Robert L. Hubbard Jr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Van Groningen, Gerard. Messianic Revelation in the Old Testament. Vol. 1. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1997.

Van Seters, John. “A Revival of the Succession Narrative and the Case Against it.” Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 39, no. 1 (2014): 3-14.

New Internationa Dictionary of Old Testament Theolgoy & Exegesis. Vol. 3. ed. Willem A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.

von Rad, Gerhard. Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Traditions. Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. Vol. 1. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962.

Vries, SJ De. "David's Victory Over the Philistine as Saga and as Legend." Journal of Biblical Literature 92, no. 1 (1973): 23-36.

Weinfeld, Moshe. "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East." Journal of the American Oriental Society (1970): 184-203.

———. "Covenant Terminology in the Ancient Near East and Its Influence on the West." Journal of the American Oriental Society (1973): 190-199.

———. "Ancient Near Eastern Patterns in Prophetic Literature." Vetus Testamentum 27, no. Fasc. 2 (1977): 178-195.

Weiser, Artur. "Die Legitimation Des Königs David: Zur Eigenart Und Entstehung Der Sogen. Geschichte Von Davids Aufstieg." Vetus Testamentum (1966): 325-354.

Wellhausen, Julius. Prolegomena to the History of Israel. Translated by J. Sutherland Black, and Allan Menzies. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1885.

Winter, Irene J. “After the Battle is Over: The “stele of the Vultures” and the Beginning of Historical Narrative in the Art of the Ancient Near East.” Studies in the History of Art Symposium Papers IV: Pictorial Narrative in Antiquity and the Middle Ages, no. 16 (1985): 11-32.

Woodhouse, John. 1 Samuel: Looking for a Leader. Preach the Word, ed. R. Kent Hughes. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2008.